



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

2106  
501B

Ind L 2106.501

B









To my friend C. R. Lanman  
a small gift  
from J. S. Speyer Feb. 1908

# Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara

FEB 22 1908

BY

FEB 22 1908

J. S. SPEYER.

---

Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam.

—AFDEELING LETTERKUNDE.

NIEUWE REEKS.

Deel VIII. №. 5.

---

AMSTERDAM,  
JOHANNES MÜLLER.  
1908.

Ind L 2106.501

B

Harvard College Library  
From the Estate of  
Charles Rockwell Lanman  
March 18, 1941

# CONTENTS.

	<i>Pages</i>
Introductory Chapter.....	1—8

## SECTION THE FIRST

### *Bṛhatkathā and Kathāsaritsāgara*

Chapter I. The Bṛhatkathāmañjari.....	9
Chapter II. The Bṛhatkathā. Its contents.....	27
Chapter III. The Bṛhatkathā. Its date and its author.....	44

## SECTION II

### *The Text of the Kathāsaritsāgara*

Chapter I. The two editions.....	61
§ 1. General comparison of the editions of Brockhaus and of Durgaprasād.....	61
§ 2. Errors and mistakes in Brockhaus' edition .....	67
§ 3. Corrections of Kathās. words and expressions to be made in the Petropolitan Dictionary .....	76
§ 4. Grammatical monstra removed.....	87
§ 5. D's edition not a critical edition.....	91
Chapter II. List of passages, the text of which has been improved in Durgaprasād's edition .....	94
Chapter III. Conjectural criticism.....	154
Chapter IV. Metrorum conspectus.....	174

---



## INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER.

---

In days of yore, when Çiva, the Lord of the Universe, was alone with his beloved wife, the daughter of Himavant, and caressed her, she asked him to tell her some charming new tale. For Indian gods and goddesses are as fond of tales as Indian men and women. The Supreme God, however reluctantly and after an unsuccessful expedient to acquit himself with little, entered upon a story of immense length and of an extraordinary charm. Pārvatī wishing to keep the whole of the pleasure to be procured by that wonderful catena of tales to herself, shut the door and ordered Nandin, Çiva's bull, to withhold any person whatsoever from coming in. In the meanwhile one of Çiva's most beloved Gaṇas, Puṣpadanta his name, went on to see his master. Being forbidden the entrance, he succeeded by dint of magic power to penetrate unseen within the presence of Çiva and Pārvatī and to overhear that new and delightful story about the seven sovereigns of the Air-spirits (Vidyādharaś). Full as he was of the great tale he had heard, he afterwards narrated it to his own wife Jayā; „for who can hide wealth or a secret from women?” She again told it over to her mistress, the wife of Çiva, for „how can women be expected to restrain their speech?” So it happened that Pārvatī knew the disclosure of the Great Narration notwithstanding the precautions taken to keep it secret, and in her wrath she cursed the indiscreet Gaṇa to be born as a man. Mālyavant, another Gaṇa, who interceded for his guilty friend, was in a similar manner damned to a human existence. She fixed, however, a limit to the punishment. „When you, Puṣpadanta, will meet in the forest with a Piçāca whose name is Kāñabhuṭi and who is properly a Yakṣa brought to the state of Piçāca by a curse of Kubera, you will remember the whole tale; then you must narrate it to

him, after which you shall be released. As to Mālyavant, he shall get free from the curse, after hearing the tale from Kāṇabhūti." Accordingly both fell down from on high and were born in the world of men. And having spent their lives with various things, they fulfilled at last and after many vicissitudes the conditions prescribed to them and so regained the upper regions and their former state. But Mālyavant, or rather Guṇāḍhya — for that was his name on earth and in his human existence — having heard the tale as it was narrated to him by Kāṇabhūti, could not recover his original state, before he had written it down and proclaimed it. Now, since the language in which it had been communicated to him was the vulgar and despised Paiçācī tongue, Kāṇabhūti being a Piçāca, and since himself was prohibited to translate it into some nobler dialect, restrained as he was by a vow from the use of Sanskrit, Prākrit and either Apabhramṣa or the conversational language of the country (*deci*)<sup>1)</sup>, six sevenths of the wondrous narration were lost from want of human audience to catch the tale and keep it. He had no other listeners than the forest-animals and the trees, on which beings he spent his recital, burning each leaf of the text after proclaiming. Finally king Sātavāhana, whose minister Guṇāḍhya had formerly been, being requested to lay hold on the tale, went up to him and preserved the rest for mankind, even this a poem of considerable size, as it extended over 100.000 çlokas.

This is the miraculous origin of that rich and splendid storehouse of manifold stories, preserved to us in a Sanskrit redaction, the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, as is narrated in its first book, „The Socle of the Tale.” Somadeva, the Kashmirian court-poet to whom we are indebted for that „largest and most interesting collection”<sup>2)</sup> of tales, is with due right considered one of the most illustrious Indian poets. And for my part, I dare say that he is one of the few Indian literary geniuses who by their relative simplicity of language, their moderation in the employment of rhetorical requisites, their aiming at clearness and appropriateness of style, their knowledge of human nature and their art of arranging the plot of a tale, may stand out the judgment of European criticism according to the standard of Occidental taste. Though he lived as late as the second part of the eleventh century, I do not hesitate to

<sup>1)</sup> Kṣemendra, *Bṛhatkathamañjari* (ed. Nirṇayas.) p. 29, gl. 51: *tyaktabhāṣātrayo* 'py aham / *paiścēm anapabhramçasam̄skṛtaprākṛtāṁ* *critah*, but Kathās. 7,148 *sam̄skṛtāṁ prākṛtāṁ* *tadvad* *decabhāṣā ca sarvadā / bhāṣātrayam idāñ* *tyaktam*.

<sup>2)</sup> WILSON, *Hindu Fiction* in his *Essays*, ed. by ROST, I, 157.

make him rank with the greatest Sanskrit authors and to place his Encyclopedia of tales (for so his „Ocean of the Streams of Story” is characterized the best) as a classical work next to the lyric poems and dramatic writings of Kālidāsa. His language charms by its purity and the proper choice of words, his style by its plainness and elegance, his metrical skill is great and is fully displayed by the number and variety of the different metres which he handles with ease and without the slightest embarrassment.

Apart from the beautiful form of the poem, its contents are of great interest. This store-house of tales may have been built at a comparatively recent time, the very eve of the Mohammedan conquest, the stories and legends gathered up in it are old ones. The Br̥hatkathā, its source, preceded it by many centuries. And this older collection must also have been made up out of traditional materials. It is a matter of fact, that some smaller collections, as the Pañcatantra and the Vetalapañcavimśati are incorporated into it; now and then the reader meets with some mythological narration from the Vedic age<sup>1)</sup> or with celebrated epic and paurānik stories, as that of Çibi and the dove (tar. 7, 88—97), of Ruru and the water-snake (tar. 14, 76—87), of Sunda and Upasunda (tar. 15, 135—140), of the birth of Skanda (tar. 21, 60 foll.), of the death of Pāṇḍu (tar. 21, 20—27), the love-story of Uṣā and Aniruddha (tar. 31, 11—33), and the extensive relation of the tale of Nala and Damayantī (56, 238—417). In other portions of the book legends of the Buddhists are often reproduced, especially in lambaka VI. The main story, however, and a large number of the episodes are Çaiva tales, as was to be expected from the supposed first narrator being no other than the Supreme God Çiva himself. From this we may infer that the original collection, the Br̥hatkathā, must have been arranged in that period of Indian history, when Buddhism exercised its sway over the Hindoo mind side by side with Çaivism and so many other manifold varieties of sectarian and local creeds, rites and theosophies.

Moreover Somadeva availed himself of the opportunities afforded by the richness and the manysidedness of his subject-matter to represent as in a mirror the different shades and aspects of multiform Indian society, its large towns, the seats of commerce and learning, as well as the wild tracks of its forest regions, inhabited by ferocious and incivilized tribes, as described in the vivid picture in tar. 102,

<sup>1)</sup> As Indra's love-making with Ahalyā (17, 137—147), his beguiling of Namuci (216—240); the latter tale however is dressed in a Buddhistic garb.

56 foll. In this respect the Kathāsaritsāgara — besides its being an arsenal of more or less ancient tales of great value for the comparative study of fancy and folklore and for the transmigration of fables and novels — depicts also to the student of the Indian world the image of medieval Indian society, its saints and its worldlings, its every-day life and its feasts, its ruling classes and its scum.

Nevertheless, only few of the tales are of the pure novelistic kind. Such stories as that of the impostors Çiva and Mādhava, who played a foul trick to a wealthy purohita (24, 82—200), and of the *jāla* and *Ada* tricks (57, 54—175), which are wholly free from the supernatural beings and things so habitual to works of Indian fancy, are seldom met with. In the great bulk of the tales there is large room for deities and spirits of the most various kinds and for secret and invisible powers of holy men or sorcerers influencing the course of the facts. In short, the Kathāsaritsāgara is an assemblage of fairy tales. Devas, Asuras, Nāgas, Yakṣas, Rakṣamīśi etc., but most of all, the Vidyādharaḥs abound in them; the magic arts, the intuitive omniscience obtained by men possessing miraculous powers, their flying through the air and commanding of spirits, their transformation of men into animals and inversely, the hideous occult rites of magicians and witches as well as divine intercession and divine protection are dealt with, as if they were the most natural things in the world. Somadeva who was a well educated man and possessed a keen intellect and an original wit, as sufficiently appears from many an incidental utterance and general remark with which he likes to intersperse his narrative,<sup>1)</sup> succeeded very well in keeping indisturbedly from the beginning to the end of his long poem that style of epic ingenuousness which affords a so great charm to that kind of writings. Now and then he reminds of Ovid by some humorous turn, but he was not so superficial as the author of the *Metamorphoseon libri*. He composed his great work for the amusement of the old queen his patroness, the wife of king Harṣa of Kashmere.<sup>2)</sup> It is hardly necessary to add that his belief in the reality of those amusing tales, however beset with gods and spirits of high regard in the creed of the Indian people, cannot have been much greater than ours!

As has been stated above, Guṇāḍhya is the reputed author of the

<sup>1)</sup> WILSON, I.I. p. 167: „We may here observe, once for all, that the stories of the Kathā Sarit Sāgara are constantly interspersed with pithy maxims of sound morality.“

<sup>2)</sup> *tasyāḥ . . . . cittavinodahetoḥ*, vs. 11 of the *pracasti* subjoined to the end of Kathās., p. 597 ed. Durgapr.

Great Tale. But his authorship cannot, of course, be extended to the first of the eighteen cantos or *lambakas*, of which it is made up. The first lambaka treats of the origin of the Great Tale and how it was made known on earth. It is king Sātavāhana who is credited for this. „After having got the Tale” says Somadeva, „Sātavāhana went to compose the Kathāpīṭha, [so is the name of lambaka I] in the same tongue [viz. the Paiçācī dialect]” tar. 8, 37. <sup>1)</sup>

The plan of the work is conformable to Indian habits of storytelling. It consists of a frame-tale, in which a large number of various other tales are stored up by the way of episodes. Sometimes the episodic narration may be itself a new frame-tale with respect to other stories. Some books, as the V<sup>th</sup>, are as a whole inserted into the main story. This design is executed with greater or lesser skill. Upon the whole the art of engraving is not so well executed in the latter books, where some old famous collections of tales, as the Pañcatantra, the adventures of Mṛgāṅkadatta and his ten companions, the Vetalapañcavimṣati are embodied in full; the last lambaka, the story of Viṣamaçīla, the vanquisher of the barbarians, looks as if it were a latter addition to a ready-made work.

The frame-tale is concerned with the *faits et gestes* of Naravāhanadatta, who was the son of Udayana, king of Vatsa, and at the same time the new embodiment of Kāma, who had become Anaṅga (bodiless) by the fire of the wrath of Āśiva. Born as the son of a human king, he reached by degrees the high and heavenly state of a Cakravartin of the Airy Spirits, the Vidyādhara. Lambaka II and III are preparatory books. They treat of his forefathers and more especially of his father, the merry Udayana, king of Vatsa, the musical prince, who is mentioned in Pañcatantra by the name of Viñāvatsa, a well-known figure both in Indian *belles lettres* and in the Buddhistic records, where he ranks among the kings contemporary with Āśkyamuni (Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 3 foll.). It is related by what contrivance he got the love and the hand of Vāsavadattā, who was to become Naravāhanadatta’s mother, daughter to the Ujjain king Caṇḍamahāsenā, and in what way he succeeded to obtain for his second wife Padmāvatī, daughter of the mighty Magadha king, finally how his great chief minister Yaugandharāyaṇa made him acquire the sovereignty over the earth.

<sup>1)</sup> Here I differ from Tawney’s translation, where *tadbhāṣayāvatarāṇ vaktum cakre* is rendered „composed the book named Kathāpīṭha, in order to show how the tale came to be first made known in the Piçāca tongue.” The instrum. is to be construed with *vaktum*, not with *avatāra*.

In lambaka IV Naravāhana's birth is told and the predictions of his future greatness.

Lambaka VI, which contains many and various pleasing stories taken for a great deal from Buddhistic sources, is devoted to the history of Kalingasenā whose daughter is destined to become Naravāhanadatta's first queen. She loved Udayana, but could not be married to him. Some Vidyādhara made her his wife by surprise, assuming the figure of that king. As the son of Udayana is an avatāra of Kāma, so it is Rati herself who is embodied into the daughter of Kalingasenā<sup>1)</sup>. Therefore, it is a matter of course that the two royal children become in due time husband and wife.

At this point of the tale, the main story begins to lose its interest. Udayana, the joyous monarch of the *dhīra lalita* type (see Lévi's *Théâtre indien*, p. 64) is evidently a popular hero of old local legend<sup>2)</sup>. He is a man of action and his performances are manifold. He and his ministers and comrades: Yaugandharāyaṇa, the wise plotter and strenuous executer of political schemes, Rumanvant the victorious commander of his armies, and Vasantaka the companion of his pleasures and the solace in his adversity are typical characters with individual features, belonging to popular tradition. But Naravāhanadatta, his ministers and the endless series of his wives, the obtaining of whom is the chief subject of the other lambakas and the main object of his exploits do not possess that stamp of people-bred origin. They are rather the result of the mechanically elaborated reproduction of the fixed type of the Cakravartin and his court, projected in Fairy Land. Always the like meetings of the son of Udayana with heavenly women who are destined to become his wives, always the same or nearly the same course of events, leading to the happy union with those princesses, in whose superhuman powers he gets gradually initiated, being in this way accustomed to take his residence among the Vidyādharas and becoming capable to conquer at last the Sovereignty in that Nephelokokkygia among the snowclad heights of holy Kailāsa. This series of similar feats and adventures, in performing which our hero, like another Virgilian Aeneas, plays a

<sup>1)</sup> Or rather, she was thought so by every one. The real child of Kalingasenā was a son, whom Prajāpati, however, according to the order of Civa exchanged for a girl of supernatural birth (*ayonijā*) who was no other than Rati. See Kathas. t. 34, 43—46; t. 110, 71. The real child, Ityaka, was conveyed to his father, the Vidyādhara, who brought him up.

<sup>2)</sup> WILSON, *Essays I*, 191 n. 2. aptly quotes stanza 31 of the Meghadūta: *prāpy Avantin Udayanakathākovida grāmavydhan.*

somewhat passive part, as he is throughout directed by the protecting hand of deities and even by Çiva himself, would be very monotonous, if it stood alone. But just here the frame-story mostly recedes behind the numerous and diversified incidental stories, so that the monotony of the so called main tale dwindles away in the background. Book XIV—XVI contain the triumph of the hero, the narrative of his wars and heroic performances by which he won that sovereignty of the Vidyādhara long promised to him. He was, however, not the first among mortals to reach that paramount power in the regions bordering on Çiva's precincts; others before him had come to it. Two entire books, the V<sup>th</sup> and the VIII<sup>th</sup> are filled with the narrative of the exploits of two predecessors; the former lambaka is a small fairy tale in itself of no little charm, the latter makes up a remarkable epic poem, celebrating the glory of the Asuras when victorious over the Devas.

H. H. WILSON was the first European scholar, who drew the attention of Occidental learning to this Storehouse of Fables. In an introductory article in the *Oriental Quarter Magazine* (March 1824, p. 63—77) and continuing his communications in the following numbers of that periodical, he gave a summary of the contents of lambaka I—V.<sup>1)</sup> It was professor BROCKHAUS who undertook the first edition of the Kathāsaritsāgara. Its first part appeared as early as 1839; it contains the same five lambakas, which had been told over by Wilson. More than twenty-five years elapsed before he succeeded to get out the rest of the work. Lambaka VI—VIII appeared in 1862; the remainder, being by far the greater portion of the whole — 12589 çlokas against 8799 contained in the first and second parts — was edited in 1866, both publications making part of the *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* and printed with Roman types, whereas the first volume, lamb. I—V, had been edited in nāgari types. The text of Brockhaus remained for a long time the work of reference for the Kathāsaritsāgara, but its authority is now superseded by the edition of DURGAPRASAD, printed at the Nirṇayasāgara press (1<sup>st</sup> impression 1889, second impr. 1903), which has been executed in a laudable manner, as will be shown in Chapter I § 1 of Section II of this treatise.

An excellent translation of the work appeared in 1880—1884

<sup>1)</sup> These papers are reprinted in WILSON'S *Essays*, collected and edited bij REINHOLD ROST in 1864. They are found in the First Volume (= Vol. III of WILSON'S *Works*), p. 156—268.

in the *Bibliotheca Indica*. Mr. C. H. TAWNEY, to whom we are indebted for it, acquitted himself of the self-imposed duty of rendering into English a work of that extent and of so high intrinsical merits in a very satisfactory manner. He has well provided those who, without acquaintance with Sanskrit, for their studies in folklore and comparative history of literature, want to draw the Indian parallels or prototypes from their genuine source.

I for my part do not enter here upon the comparison of the numberless tales told in our Ocean of Streams of Tales. The present investigations do not go beyond the limits of Indology. They wholly belong to the field of critical and philological research. I have divided them into two sections. The former of them is devoted to the questions pertaining to the Bṛhatkathā; in the second section the differences of the text in the two editions of the Kathāsaritsāgara, and some points of criticism are dealt with.

---

## SECTION I.

### BRIHATKATHĀ AND KATHĀSARITSĀGARA.

#### CHAPTER I.

##### THE BRHATKATHAMĀÑJARĪ.

As Somadeva explicitly affirms, his great store-house of tales and stories of all kind is not a composition of his own invention, nor is it a compilation from various sources, but a sanskritization of an older and more extensive poem written in a vulgar dialect. He says in the introductory verses of his work that it is the reproduction in a condensed shape of the Br̥hatkathā, the fabulous origin of which is narrated in its particulars in his first *lambaka*, the Kathāpiṭha. He has nothing added to its contents nor has he omitted anything: *yathā mūlam tathairaitan na manāg apy atikramah* (t. 1, 10); he has only abridged it and made a Sanskrit poem of it: *granthavistarasaṁkṣepamātram bhāṣā ca bhidyate*<sup>1)</sup>, taking care besides to embellish his epitome with the indispensable adornments required in a kāvya, yet in this going only as far as was compatible with his main purpose to keep intact the relish of the tales narrated in the old poem<sup>2)</sup>. So he had the right to style his work a *Br̥hatkathāsārasaṅgraha* (Summary of the quintessence of Br̥hatkathā), as he does in the beginning of his poem: t. 1, 3 *Br̥hatkathāyāḥ sārasya saṅgrahāṇi racayāmy aham*, and in one of the concluding verses, which are wanting in the ed. of Brockhaus, but are found in that of Durgaprasād, p. 597, cl. 12:

*nānākathāmṛtamayasya Br̥hatkathāyāḥ  
sāraśyā sajjanamanombudhipūrṇacandraḥ  
SOMENA vipravarabhrūriguṇābhīrāma-  
RĀMATmajena vihitāḥ khalu saṅgraho 'yam.*

<sup>1)</sup> I quote this line, as it is edited in Durgaprasād's edition. The altered text apud Brockhaus, *bhāṣā ca viḍyate* may further be left aside. Nor is it longer necessary to take here *bhāṣā* = 'Sanskrit' in the Pāṇinean signification of the word, as Hall did (*Pref.* to his edition of Subandhu's *Vāsavadatta*, p. 24 n.) in his refutation of the wrong and erroneous translation of this line by Brockhaus.

<sup>2)</sup> More about this cloka see below, p. 31 foll.

Now, as long as no other testimony was known, that is, until 1859, very distinguished scholars disbelieved the real existence of such a voluminous work in a Prākrit dialect, as the Brhatkathā was claimed for. Could the Kashmirian composer of the Kathāsaritsāgara not have fancied that origin of his work which by itself is an encyclopedia of products of fancy? Must his statement be taken *à la lettre*? A statement, moreover, susceptible to find little credit also on this ground that the tale narrated about the reputed author of that famous Brhatkathā himself, Guṇādhya, is full of unhistorical matter and miraculous incidents, in short, a mere fairy tale. The first editor of the Kathāsaritsāgara went even so far in the way of mistrust, that in the Preface of the first volume of his edition, which was published in 1839, he explained the distinct avowal of Somadeva about the substrate of his poem in a sense diametrically opposed to the words he pretended to comment upon: „Sein Verdienst beruht wohl hauptsächlich in der gleichmässig stylistischen Redaction des früher unter mancherlei Formen in Prosa und Versen Zerstreuten.” In the subsequent volumes, which appeared in 1866 and 1868, he did not repeal that view.

Yet he might have learned as early as 1859 that Somadeva's statement about the Brhatkathā had been corroborated by other evidence. In that year FITZ EDWARD HALL, in the Preface to his edition of Subandhu's romance in prose Vāsavadattā, drew the attention to the fact, unobserved before, that such high authorities as Daṇḍin in his Kāvyādarça, Bāṇa in his Harṣacarita, and already Subandhu himself, prior to Bāṇa, knew and praised the great Prākrit poem of Guṇādhya, and that, according to the manner in which they refer to it, we may feel convinced that it enjoyed a great popularity in their time. A passage in Subandhu's romance contains even an allusion to a story told in the Brhatkathā which is actually found in our Kathāsaritsāgara. P. 110 *asti Br̥hatkathā-lumbair iva cālabhañjikopetair veçmabhir upaçobhitam..... Kusu-mapuram*. Subandhu, comparing the houses of Pāṭaliputra adorned with columns bearing the shape of human figures (*cālabhañjikās*) to the cantos of the Brhatkathā, in which *cālabhañjikā* is likewise met with, alludes to the story of the gambler Thinthākarāla and his beloved Kālavatī, the Apsaras who was changed by Indra's curse into a pillar statuette (*cālabhañjikā*) but recovered her proper form by the cunning of her lover (Kathās. 121, 72—186).<sup>1)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> Hall, l.l. p. 20, writing his Preface at a time when only five of the eighteen lambakas of Kathāsaritsāgara had been published, errs in the interpretation of *cālabhañjika*.

In 1871, A. C. BURNELL, in a letter to *The Academy*, written at Tanjore July 21 and printed in the number of 15 Sept. of that periodical, brought to notice that he had discovered a MS of another Sanskrit redaction of the Br̥hatkathā, different from that of Somadeva. „This turns out” he wrote, „to be almost identical in matter with the Kathāsaritsāgara. The tales are almost the same, even in the names; the arrangement (as far as I have been able to examine the MSS) is much the same, but the style is not so good. The tales are told in a very bald way, and shorter than in the K. S. S.; though here and there one finds long and tedious descriptions.” This first hint was followed in the next year by the masterly article of G. BÜHLER in the First Volume of the *Indian Antiquary* (p. 302 foll.); in this he gave an account of another MS of the same work, the Br̥hatkathāmañjarī of Kṣemendra which he had acquired for the Government of Bombay. He established these two important facts: 1<sup>ly</sup> that both Somadeva and Kṣemendra worked on the same text; 2<sup>ly</sup> that they composed their poems independently from one another. From some discrepancies in the names for the rest common to both, he drew arguments to prove the correctness of the statement of both abbreviators as to the original Br̥hatkathā being composed in Paiçācī. His judgment about the character of the poem of Kṣemendra agreed with that of Burnell. „His brevity makes him unintelligible and his style is far from being easy and flowing” (l. l. p. 306). After comparing with each other the story of Putraka as told by Somadeva in tar. 3 of the Kathās. and by Kṣemendra in the 2<sup>d</sup> guccha of his lambaka I, he concludes thus: „I could easily add a dozen other instances, where particulars given in the Kathāsaritsāgara are *hinted at* but *not developed* in the Vṛhatkathā” (l. l. p. 308). Cp. also his *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS* (1877), p. 47.

In order to demonstrate his views, Bühler had published in the paper quoted a few passages from the first lambaka of the Br̥hatkathāmañjarī, especially the story of Upakoçā. It was not till 1885 that other portions were put under the press. SYLVAIN LÉVI edited the first lambaka (or lambhaka)<sup>1)</sup> in full in the *Journal Asiatique* of Nov.—Dec. of that year, and in a subsequent article, in the number of Febr.—Apr. 1886 also the first and second Vetāla

<sup>1)</sup> Both spellings are found, it seems, in the manuscripts: Bühler, l.l. p. 307 n. 1 quotes from fol. 349 a 6 of his MS *lambhakasamgrahaḥ*, cp. Lévi J. As. (1885 II) p. 450, but ed. Bombay p. 33 *prathamo lambakah*, *dvitīyo lambakah*, and cp. *supra*, p. 10 the passage of Subandhu, dealing with *Br̥hatkathālambaiḥ*, apparently the name of the sections of the original Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā.

tales. He used for that purpose both MSS then available in Europe: that acquired by Bühler (B) and a copy of that which Burnell had detected (A); for the *Vetāla* tales he availed himself also of a third MS, likewise acquired by Bühler and belonging to the Poona library (C<sup>1</sup>), which does not contain the first lambaka. By the bye, it may be noted that none of those MSS has the complete text. L. von Mańkowski who published the *Pañcatantra*-portion of *Bṛhkm.* in 1892<sup>2</sup>) had but one MS, Lévi's B, to make use of, this portion being wanting both in A and C<sup>3</sup>).

By this additional number of çlokas — 308 — published for the first time by Mańkowski, the proportion of the printed portion of the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* to that not yet printed was brought up to almost 1 : 10½.

In the meanwhile several more MSS have been discovered. AUFRECHT in his *Catalogus Catalogorum* registers 4 in the first, 3 in the second, and 2 in the third volume *sub voce* *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, besides 2 others that consist of smaller fragments (as one mentioned in Part III which contains only the *Vetālapañcavimśati*); among them are also the copies which Burnell had caused to be taken of A. Besides he mentions, in Part I, 2 MSS sub titulo *Bṛhatkathā*, one of which is his *Kāṭm.* 7, the other is one of the *pustakāni* that belonged to the pāṇḍit Rādhākrṣṇa of Lahore. Probably these notices refer to the work of Kṣemendra<sup>4</sup>).

Finally, in 1901 the whole work has been printed at the Nirṇayasāgara Press. The title-page names Mahāmahopādhyāya Pāṇḍit Çivadatta and Kāçināth Pāṇḍurang Parab as editors. There is no preface at all nor is there given any account of the MSS that are the basis for the constitution of the text. From the short and scanty critical foot-notes we are allowed to infer that the editors had two manuscripts at their disposition, one denoted क and the other ख; each of them full of gaps and corruptions, but together they make up almost the complete poem. Neither of them may be identified with C or some copy of C, since the first lambaka is wanting in neither. The MS ख is either = B

<sup>1</sup>) This MS seems to be identical with nr. 821 on p. CLXX of Bühler's *Detailed Report*.

<sup>2</sup>) L. von Mańkowski, *Der Auszug aus den Pañcatantra in Kshemendras Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 1892.

<sup>3</sup>) For the first 47 çlokas he availed himself also of another MS, as far as it was printed in the preface of Peterson's ed. of the *Hitopadeça*, see his 'Einleitung' p. XII.

<sup>4</sup>) Lévi, Journ. As. 1886, p. 182 I, affirms that the MSS B and C mentioned above, „ne connaissent que le nom de *Bṛhatkathā*.“

or very akin to it; ख seems to be different from both A and B. The Nirṇayasāgarapress must have possessed one of them in 1888: for on the first page of its edition of the Kathāsaritsāgara, footnote 3 contains an information about *asmadīyan Brhatkathāmañjaripustakam*, of which it is said that it is *açuddham*, *prārambhe kīcīt trūtitam asti*. The second must have been acquired between 1888 and 1901.

The edition itself (Kāvyamālā 69) exhibits a disadvantageous contrast to the valuable edition of Kathāsaritsāgara printed at the same Nirṇayasāgarapress. The avowedly bad condition of the MSS available does not afford a sufficient excuse for the bad workmanship of those who carried out the editio princeps of a so highly important text. They discharged themselves of their task carelessly and hastily and did not avail themselves of the ready at hand instruments for correcting obvious misreadings in their manuscripts. In 1871 Bühler could not know that the father of Kṣemendra was named Prakāçendra; when he edited *Ind. Ant.* I, 307 n. 2 *Prakāçandābhīdho 'bhavat*, he reproduced the reading of his MS, the rightness of which he was not able to control at that time. But the two Pandits editing in 1901 a work of Kṣemendra, should not have kept that corrupted reading in their text (see p. 619, cl. 31 and cp. e.g. p. 164, cl. 2 of the Daçāvatāracarita edited in 1891 at the same Nirṇayasāgarapress by the same Kāçīnāth and his father Durgaprasād). A close comparison with the parallel passages in Kathās. being a valuable help, yea almost indispensable for any one who had undertaken the task of a critical edition, worthy of the Kāvyamālā series, they show but very rarely that they did so; as a rule they either neglected that useful and easy cross-examination or did so in a superficial manner. To leave aside their neglect or ignorance of the readings published by Bühler, Lévi, Mańkowski in the portions edited previously<sup>1)</sup>, they failed sometimes to realize the incoherent and perturbated condition of the text of their manuscripts. Lamb. XIV, p. 494, cl. 309 they were not aware that the former line is a dittography of cl. 305 a. — In lambaka IX, p. 274—277, the story of Çrīdarçana is rendered wholly unintelligible, owing to the fact that two different portions of it are intermixed! Remove cl. 745 b—761 from their place and insert them between 728 and 729: all will be put

<sup>1)</sup> Thinking it may be profitable to the perusers of the edition of Brhkm. to have at hand the better readings of those European scholars for correcting the bad ones of their printed text, I have put them together in an appendix, annexed to this chapter.

right and the concord with the parallel passage in Kathās. (73, 305—359) will be restored. — Another instance of the same lack of attention. P. 402 and 403 of their edition, in the same lambaka IX, the 3<sup>d</sup> guecha (cl. 1—10) opens with the continuation of the adventures of Mṛgāṅkadatta at the point when Vyāghrasena finishes his relation of the events which had happened to himself and his comrades, whereupon Mṛgāṅkadatta sets out for Ujjain; these matters are told in Kathās. tar. 101 and 102. But at cl. 11 we are on a sudden transported into the story of Kesaṭa and Kandarpa, a quite different tale which is found in Kathās. tar. 123. From cl. 11 to 64 the narration of Kṣemendra corresponds to Kathās. 123, 203—430. But at cl. 64, lo we are back again, as suddenly as we left them before, to the gallant Mṛgāṅkadatta and his faithful followers. What has happened? That portion of the story of Kesaṭa which disturbs in that singular manner the regular course of the Mṛgāṅkadattakathā, was by some accident or other gone astray and had been put into the wrong place. By transporting it to p. 430 in lambaka X and filling up with it the large gap which the editors signalize on that page after cl. 241, the due order will be restored. — In lamb. XIV the çlokas 401, 402 and 407 have been put into a wrong place; they ought to be transposed after cl. 394.

Upon the whole, I conclude, the so called edition of the Br̥hatkathāmañjari scatters with errors of print and of other kinds.

But even so we receive that editio princeps thankfully. Now, at least, that important poem is brought within the reach of everybody, and not to be silent also about something praiseworthy in the work of the two Pandits, the alphabetical list of proper names subjoined offers a precious help to whosoever desires to compare with each other the different Sanskrit representatives of a given story told in the original Prākrit Br̥hatkathā. Now also every one may easily control the exactness of the judgment of Bühler and Lévi on the nature and the poetical worth of the abstract of that poem composed by Kṣemendra. Its length is a little greater than was to be expected from the statement of Bühler *Ind. Ant.*, l. l. p. 304 about the colophon of the MS acquired by him; the whole work is estimated there at 7080 granthas, yet the printed text of the Br̥hatkathāmañjari amounts to a little more than 7561 çlokas.<sup>1)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> I have left without computation the pariçīṭa, wanting in the MSS used by the editors, of the 24<sup>th</sup> story of the Vetaṭa, and added at the end of the book from a Tanjore MS by the care of T. S. Kuppūsvāmī. I have a strong presumption that this portion of 75 çlokas does not belong to the work of Kṣemendra.

Since the Kathāsaritsāgara, if I have exactly computed, consists of 21388, the size of Kṣemendra's abstract is a little greater than the third part of that composed by Somadeva.

The following synopsis may show the concordance of the lambakas in both.

	<i>Bṛhatkathāmañjari</i>		<i>Kathāsaritsāgara</i>
Kathā-	lambaka I in 3 gucchas of 72	lambaka I in 8 taraṅgas =	818 cl.
pīṭha	+ 223 + 97 = 392 cl.		
Kathā-	„ II in 2 gucchas	„ II „ 6 „ =	871 „
mukha	of 147 + 274 = 421 „		
Lāvānaka	„ III = 414 „	„ III „ 6 „ =	1198 „
Naravā-	„ IV = 142 „	„ IV „ 3 „ =	501 „
hanajanma			
Caturdā-	„ V = 263 „	„ V „ 3 „ =	818 „
rīkā			
Sūryapra-	„ VI = 245 „	„ VIII „ 7 „ =	1544 „
bha			
Madana-	„ VII = 612 „	„ VI „ 8 „ =	1421 „
mañcukā			
Velā	„ VIII = 75 „	„ XI „ 1 „ =	115 „
Çacāṅka-	„ IX in 3 gucchas of 882	„ XII „ 36 „ =	4929 „
vatī	+ 1435 + 118 = 2435 „		
Viśamaçīla	„ X = 288 <sup>1</sup> „	„ XVIII „ 5 „ =	1120 „
Madirāvatī	„ XI = 83 „	„ XIII „ 1 „ =	220 „
Padmāvatī	„ XII = 115 „	„ XVII „ 6 „ =	993 „
Pañca	„ XIII = 236 „	„ XIV „ 4 „ =	624 „
Ratna-	„ XIV = 508 „	„ VII „ 9 „ =	1628 „
prabhā			
Alamkā-	„ XV = 375 „	„ IX „ 6 „ =	1739 „
ravatī			
Çaktiyaças	„ XVI = 646 „	„ X „ 10 „ =	2128 „
Mahā-	„ XVII = 55 „	„ XV „ 2 „ =	301 „
bhiṣeka			
Surata-	„ XVIII = 215 „	„ XVI „ 3 „ =	420 „
mañjari			

<sup>1</sup>) This number is a little too low, and the former as much too high, owing to the intermixture of part of the story of Kesaṭa and Kandarpa in the adventures of Mṛgañ-kadatta, as is explained above.

Two things in this juxtaposition strike the eyes: the *different arrangement* after the fifth lambaka and the *inequality* in the treatment of the subject-matters in both collections. Putting off the difference in the order of the lambakas and the question as to the original arrangement in the Prākrit Br̥hatkathā to the following chapter, the difference as regards the briefness or the detailed description in narrating the same tales is sometimes very considerable. In some lambakas: Kathāpiṭha, Kathāmukha, Çaçāṅkavatī, Suratamañjarī, Kṣemendra makes up a little less than half the number of clokas of Somadeva, but in others he is much shorter. In Viśamaçīla, Ratnaprabhā, Caturdārikā and Çaktiyaças the proportion is between  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{3}$ , in Alamkāravatī between  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{5}$ ; Sūryaprabha has in the collection of Somadeva even more than six times the size it has in the Br̥hkmañjarī, owing, methinks, to the dislike of Kṣemendra to dwell on the particulars of that battle-epic of the old stamp, which describes a victory of Asuras over Devas and which under the able hands of Somadeva has grown into a charming heroic poem adorned with the manifold art but not too much crowded with the luxuriant excrescences of his native alamkāra.

A close comparison of the several parallel narrations in both cannot but confirm that impression of inequality. It will soon appear that it is the fault of Kṣemendra, not of Somadeva who, in striking contrast with his rival, has succeeded in keeping throughout the whole length of his composition the same style and the same proportions of his narrative. By this equability and harmony he surpasses Kṣemendra in a very high degree. Likewise by his limpidity and his moderation in the employment of the various artifices, tricks and habits taught by Indian poeties and practised by Indian writers. He possesses qualities relatively seldom found with Sanskrit court-poets and sought for in vain in the Br̥hatkathāmañjarī. We have quoted above (p. 11) the verdict pronounced in a few words by Burnell about the *obscurity* and the *tedious waste of rhetoric embellishments* which spoil the pleasure while reading there the same stories that captivate the reader of the Kathāsaritsāgara. In fact, aiming at the glory of producing a compendious Br̥hatkathā, Kṣemendra does too often care little about the clearness and perspicuity of style, which are indispensable requisites in a story-teller; on the other hand, his aspiration at the fame of a master in *vaidagdhyā* makes him rather propense to subordinate the contents of the tales to the opportunity of rhetorical show. For skilled as he was in handling the manifold tools of *alamkāra* and being eager for displaying that skill, he too often delights in such descriptions

as he thought suitable for displaying his mastership in poetics.  
*Purpureus, late qui splendeat, unus et alter assuitur pannus.*

Since it does not lie within the scope of this disquisition to enter into an estimation of the poet Kṣemendra, I refer the reader to the brilliant essay on this subject of SYLVAIN LÉVI in the *Journ. As.* of 1885. Yet it may be suitable to urge some prominent characteristics which appear in the Br̥hatkathāmañjarī. Kṣemendra has a relish for expatiating in describing erotic matters. So at the outset of lamb. IX, corresponding to Kathās. tar. 68, 1 foll., he interweaves in the visit of Lalitalocanā to Naravāhanadatta a description of her beauty, not found in the Kathās. In the first vetāla-tale he complacently enlarges the account of the voluptuous *suvarṇī* of Padmāvatī and her prince; the verses Br̥hk. p. 297, 120—126 correspond to the one cloka Kathās. 75, 131. In the 7<sup>th</sup> vetāla Kṣ. (= 6<sup>th</sup> Som.) three additional clokas (p. 319, 397—399) are bestowed on the beauty of the bathing laundress. The story of Jimūtavāhana, as narrated in the 16<sup>th</sup> vetāla, offers him the opportunity of drawing a detailed picture of the extraordinary grace and beauty of Malayavatī, which he executes in due order, beginning with a praise of her feet and concluding with the top of her head; no less than twelve clokas are required for it, whereas the Kathāsaritsāgara can suffice with five (Br̥hk. p. 351, 792—803 cp. to Kathās. 90, 41—45). — Among the digressions of a different nature I mention Br̥hk. p. 389, 1275—1283: praise of Sundarasena, his beauty and prowess (cp. Kathās. 101, 46); p. 461, 138—145: praise of lake Pampā (cp. Kathās. 107, 9); p. 239, 295—305: dance of Hamsāvalī (cp. Kathās. 71, 76, 77); p. 350, cl. 783—789: description of the penance-grove of Jimūtavāhana; of the sea and of the tempest, that broke the ship of Samudradatta (p. 121, cl. 78 foll.); of heavenly and atmospherical phenomena (p. 57, cl. 142 foll.). Likewise p. 292, 62 foll. the cīmçapātree with the dead body hanging on it; not to speak of that famous bombastic patch descriptive of the awful cemetery in the first vetāla, treated by Lévi *Journ. As.* 1886 I, p. 191.

The fault of too great conciseness and of obscurity in telling the tales is exhibited very differently. Some portions of the Br̥hkmañjarī suffer more from it than others. Mańkowski who edited the Pañcatantra section happened to fall into a part of the poem, where its author seems to have striven at the utmost brevity; perhaps owing to his averseness from analogies or to some other reason he hurried over that track of the Great Tale. Nor did he feel much liking for the mūrkhakathās which, in Somadeva's poem, are inter-

spersed between the different parts of Pañcatantra. Most of them he put aside entirely; the few to which he gave a place — twelve upon the whole (one of them not found in Kathās.) against 47 in Kathās. tar. 61—63 — are so condensed that they can hardly be understood and have lost all their flavour. So e. g. this çloka

*abudho bhāñdadāridryād ekasmin nidadhe ghaṭe  
vahnīm jalām ca kāryārthām yenāsau hāsyatām yayau ||*  
(p. 588, çl. 572)

is the parallel of Kathās. 61, 10—13:

*mandabuddhir abhūt kaçcit; pumān niçi sa caikadā  
prabhāte devatāpūjām karisyann ity acintayat ||  
upayuktāu mama snānadhūpādyarthām jalānalau,  
sthāpayāmi tad ekasthau, tau çīghram prāpnuyām yathā ||  
ity ālocyāmbukumbhāntah kṣiptvāgnim samviveça sah.  
prātaç ca vīkṣate yāvad, gato 'gnir naṣṭam ambu ca ||  
aṅgāramaline toye dṛṣṭe tasyābhavan mukham  
tādrg eva, sahāsasya lokasyāsit punah smitam ||*

The following one

*kaçcid vyadhāc ca jāyāyā labdhvālamkarānam bahu  
rasanām abudhāḥ kanṭhe hāram ca jaghanasthale ||*

(p. 588, çl. 575)

is the sapless remnant of the ἀστεῖον, related by Somadeva (61, 24—27) in this manner:

*grāmyah kaçcit khanan bhūmin prāpalañkarānam mahat ||  
rātrāu rājakulāc caurair nītvā tatra niveçitam.  
yad gr̄hitvā sa talraiva bhāryām tena vyabhūṣayat ||  
babandha mekhalañm mūrdhni hāram ca jaghanasthale  
nūparau karayos tasyāḥ karṇayor api kañkanau ||  
hasadbhiḥ khyāpitam lokair buddhvā rājā jahāra tat  
tasmāt svābharañam, tam tu paçuprāyam mumoca sah ||*

Such cases, however, of extreme aridity are comparatively rare. On the other hand, now and then the mind of the reader is gladdened, when he falls in with some piece written in an easy and pleasing style and without misuse of rhetoric implements, and which, though inferior to the greater genius of Somadeva, may stand to some extent the comparison with their parallels in the Kathāsaritsāgara. The narrative, in a few cases, may be even broader. The episode of Kalingasenā carried through the air by the asurī Somaprabhā her friend, firstly to old Cyenajit [= Prasenajit in Kathās.] afterwards to young Udayana is told in eighteen çlokas (p. 186, 339—356), whereas twelve suffice in the correspondent

place of Kathās. (31, 40—51). The fable of the mouse, the cat, the owl and the ichneumon is, if not fuller, yet more detailed in the Br̥hk.mañjarī (p. 197, 477—496) than it is in Kathās. 33, 106—129. This confirms once more what I have said about the *inequality* of the work of Kṣemendra, who at other times took such care to epitomize stories told at great extent in his original, that he e.g. reduced the chief incidents of the story of Aćokadatta to a few lines (cp. Br̥hk.mañjarī p. 126 with Kathās. 25, 162 foll.), and summarized the whole tale of Muktāphaladvaja, which fills up two taraṅgas of 416 clokas together in Kathās., in *fifteen* clokas (Br̥hk.mañjarī p. 448, 101—115) <sup>1)</sup>.

To notice also another feature, which struck me while perusing the poem of Kṣemendra, he *clings more to things religious* than Somadeva. I do not say that his religious feeling is deeper. In common natures profoundness of that sentiment is ordinarily not found; and I am inclined to give more credit in that point to the fine and delicate mind of the knower of men, to whom we owe the Kathās., than to the polygraphist made of coarser stuff, always ready to write a poem on a given subject. Kṣemendra was well versed in mythological and theological matters. One of his spiritual teachers was a fervent Bhāgavata, another, his upādhyāya in rhetoric, the famous Čaiva philosopher Abhinavagupta, and he must have grown up in an atmosphere of devout practices. We learn from the praçasti at the end of his Br̥hk.mañjarī, as well as from those appended to other poems of his that his father was a very pious man, and wealthy, too, who placed statues of gods in the temple of Svayambhū and bestowed a quarter of a *kotī* viz.  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions on pious works. Among his other writings two bear an exclusively religious character; one of them, the Daçāvatāracarita, praises the ten avatāras of Viṣṇu, in the other, the Avadānakalpalatā, his last composition, he extols with a magnificent apparel the lofty deeds of self-sacrifice of the Bodhisattva. He was thoroughly acquainted, it seems, with both religions, <sup>2)</sup> and would willingly preach in his verses on topics of morals and religion. That is why even

<sup>1)</sup> There are even a few instances of tales summarized in *one cloka*, as how Cañamahāsena got his wife, the daughter of the Daitya Aṅgāraka (p. 48, 27), and the story of Cakra (p. 536, 314) who bore the flaming wheel. I mention this also to correct my statement about the absence of that story from the Br̥hk.mañjarī in my article on The Man with the Wheel (*Bijdragen van het Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Ned. Indië*, 1906, p. 199). The name Cakra does not occur in the Index of the edited text.

<sup>2)</sup> His familiarity with Buddhist *termini* and Buddhist ideas appears, if we compare parallel places of him and Somadeva in those cases where Buddhist matters play a

such a worldly poem, as his abstract of the Br̥hatkathā really is, contains comparatively large portions devoted to such matters. Devatāstutis are not wanting in the Kathās. neither; both Somadeva and Kṣemendra must have found them in the Paiçācī original, but on such occasions the latter in length and exuberance of them outdoes the former. In the story of the Kaçmīr king Bhūnanda or Bhūnandana — cp. Br̥hk. p. 266 foll. with Kathās. 73, 79 foll. — who took his way to Pātāla through a Kaçmīr entrance to the subterranean world, the local legend about this *aditus ad inferos* is incidentally related; how Pradyumna, watching for his son Aniruddha led away to Pātāla by his sweetheart Uṣā, obtained from Gaurī the favour that she would keep guard on the mountain commanding that entrance. In Kathās. 73, 110 it is simply said that „he won over Cārikā with hundreds of praises”; Kṣemendra makes him utter a stotra in full ten çlokas (642—651). The concluding lambaka (XVIII) of the latter relates among other things the death of the old king Udayana. On hearing the news of it, Naravāhanadatta, his son, bursts out in lamentations. To Somadeva a few lines suffice to describe this complaint, his affliction and mourning and the words of consolation of his attendance (cp. the parallel passage t. 111, 86 foll.); Kṣemendra would not allow himself to lose this opportunity of dwelling upon common-place sentences about the inanity and vanity of all human things and the necessity of death; he spends on that sermon no less than *thirty* çlokas. In another case he combines his claim of paramouit poetical skill with his devotion, when he describes the glory and great feats of Viñu in artful prose embellished by long compounds and the like, which passage by a singular whim he put into his metrical composition, no other prose occurring in it. It is found p. 526 of the printed text and corresponds with the stuti Kathās. t. 54, 29—38. On another occasion, in vētāla nr. 12, we meet with *three* āryā stanzas to expound the power of Karma and its fruit, corresponding with *one* similar stanza of Somadeva (Br̥hkm. 335, 597—599 cp. with Kath. 86, 45). Sometimes his predilection for moral sentences and the like makes him do wrong to the *aucitya* he had to observe in the representation of the hero of his tale. In the 16<sup>th</sup> vētāla, a subject-matter quite of his liking — for it

part in the narration. So P. 158, gl. 9 Sukhāvatī, the Elysium of Mahāyānists, is mentioned, but the word puzzled the editors who put a sign of interrogation after it; likewise p. 592, cl. 616, where the corrupt form from one ms. *surāvanīm* has been put into the text, the other has *sukhāvanīm*. — P. 166 in the sermon on *vairāgya* the name of king Kṛki occurs, but it lies hidden under the corruptions *hukeḥ* and *kaveḥ*.

deals with Jīmūtavāhana's self-sacrifice, and in fact, no less than 170 çlokas of his succinct poem are occupied with it, but 30 less than the number of Somadeva's narrative of the same story — it is told how the Bodhisattva intervened at the very moment when the mother of the Nāga was taking leave of her son destined to become the prey of the Garuḍa. In this point he makes Jīmūtavāhana address the mother as follows (p. 358):

*mātaḥ sthito 'smi te putraparitrāṇakṛtakṣayāḥ  
paropakāraḥ saṃsāre niḥśāre prāpyate kutaḥ || 876.  
ayam eva sadāpāye kāye sūrasamuccayaḥ  
yat prayāti parāyāsa trāṇasatpunyapātratām || 877.*

He displays here a want of taste which is offensive. Such boasting of his self-sacrifice does not become the hero. Somadeva makes him say nothing more than these few words: *mātaḥ putram rakṣāmy aham tava* (t. 90, 131); his Bodhisattva does not preach in that critical moment, but acts only.

Both poets were Kashmirians and almost coeval. They belong to the eleventh century, at what time Kashmir was a centre of Sanskrit learning and literary productions. BÜHLER demonstrated in 1885 that Somadeva composed the Kathāsaritsāgara between 1063 and 1082.<sup>1)</sup> As to Kṣemendra he said: „Dieses Resultat zeigt, dass Somadeva entweder genau zu derselben Zeit schrieb, als Kṣemendra-Vyāsadāsa seine Br̥hatkathāmañjarī verfasste oder nur wenig später.... Es ist jedenfalls ein merkwürdiges Zusammentreffen, dass zwei kaśmīrische Dichter um dieselbe Zeit das alte Buch Guṇādhyas aus dem Paiśācī-方言 ins Sanskrit übersetzten. Es sieht beinahe so aus alsob sie Rivalen gewesen wären”. SYLVAIN LÉVI urged both points. As to Kṣemendras priority in time his argument, developed in the *Journal Asiatique* 1886, I, 216 foll., is to this effect. Considering that he composed three extracts of celebrated epics: the Bhāratamañjarī, the Rāmāyaṇamañjarī and the Br̥hatkathāmañjarī, and that this triad makes up the least accomplished portion of his complete works, he holds it for probable that all three belong to his beginnings. Now „la Bhāratamañjarī, le premier des ouvrages datés de Kshemendra est antérieure de vingt-sept ans à l'année 1064 et de 145 ans à l'année 1082. Il serait, croyons-nous, étrange de supposer qu'un poète rompu par une si longue pratique, connu déjà par une quantité d'oeuvres de toute sorte, se fût réduit à traduire en sanscrit une oeuvre païcācī;

<sup>1)</sup> *Sitzungsb. der Wiener Akademie philos. u. hist. philol. Classe*, CX, 545 foll. The passage quoted is on p. 558.

et même, cette hypothèse admise, qu'il se fut, avec un acquit de quelque trente ou quarante ans, aussi mal tiré de la besogne." This argument, a „raison presque de sentiment”, as it is styled by Lévi himself, has not so great stress as the other derived from the introductory verses of the Kathāsaritsāgara, t. 1, 11 and 12:

aucityānvayarakṣū ca yathācakti vidhīyate  
kathārasāvighātena kāvyāṇçasya ca yojanā ||  
vaidagdhyakhyātilobhāya mama naivāyam udyamah  
kim tu nānākathājālasmr̥tisaukr̥tyasiddhaye ||

These clokas, according to him, are an implicit disapproval of the work of his predecessor, which as a matter of fact is imbued with the selfsame defects as are disclaimed by Somadeva in order to justify his own composition. In this point I fully agree with Lévi. Cloka 12 so unmistakably hints at some rival poet or some rivalizing literary work, that long before I knew anything about the Br̥hatkathāmañjarī, I understood Somadeva's declaration as having a polemic character. And forsooth, he who knows both sanskritizations of the Br̥hatkathā cannot but acknowledge in Somadeva's protestation against the *vaidagdhyakhyātilobha* his making front against the rhetorical style of Kṣemendra and that showy self-ostentation as perspires among others in his *prācasti* at the end of his poem, where he boasts of himself: *Kṣemendranāmā tanayas tasya vidvatsu viçrutah / prayātah kavigoṣṭhīsu nāmagrahanayogyaṭām* (p. 620, cl. 36). „Il semble donc naturel de croire qu'en écrivant ces vers Somadeva pensait à son précurseur.”

My interpretation of cl. 11 is different from that of Lévi. This is partly in consequence of a various reading, partly because he misunderstood the meaning of the words *aucitya* and *anvaya*. As to the difference of reading, *vidhīyate* (Durgapr.'s ed.) seems preferable to *abhidhīyate* (Brockhaus); but in 1886 the ed. of Durgapr. had not yet appeared.<sup>1)</sup> *Aucitya* does not mean „les convenances littéraires”<sup>2)</sup>; it is the technical term to signify ‘appropriateness’

<sup>1)</sup> I am inclined to think that the fault in Brockhaus' ed. does not originate in his mss., but in some mistake either in copying or rather of the typographer. Cl. 10 l. 2 his ed. has *vidyate* instead of *bhidhīyate* but cl. 11, l. 1 *bhidhīyate* for *vidhīyate*. There can be no question about the correctness of the readings of Durgaprasad's edition. The false ones have led astray every scholar who before tried to explain these lines. As long as the interpretation rested on a corrupt text, they were reputed to be „difficult”; the genuine text is plain.

<sup>2)</sup> „J'ai respecté, autant que j'ai pu, les convenances littéraires et l'ordre naturel; j'ai établi chacune des sections du poème de manière à ne pas interrompre les contes

taken in the widest sense of the word and bearing as well on the different objects, characters, individualities to be represented in a poetical composition as on the adorning implements and the choice of words, expressions and images<sup>1)</sup>. *Aucityānvaya*, then, is the same as *aucityānvitalvam*, literally „the being provided with appropriateness”. Lévi also misunderstood *kāvyāmṛṣasya yojanā*. Mańkowski rightly objects that the sing. *kāvyāmṛṣasya* cannot at any rate mean „chacune des sections du poème” (see the passage quoted p. 22 note 2), but his own interpretation, that *kāvyāmṛṣa* should be referred to some special part of the poem, is right neither. To catch the meaning of *kāvyāmṛṣa*, it must be compared with *devāmṛṣa*, *amṛṣavataraṇa* and the like. Somadeva declares that he does not claim the pretension of making a *kāvya* out of the Br̥hatkathā, he has only admixed a small portion of *kāvya* qualities to the simple collection of popular tales. In other terms, *amṛṣa* has here a significance not unlike *gandhi* at the end of compounds taught by Pāṇini V, 4, 136, ‘a tinge of’, ‘a little of.’ My translation of cl. 11 is accordingly: „I have taken care to preserve the appropriateness (of description, diction etc. of the original work) and I have added to it some qualities proper to a *kāvya*, without, however, spoiling by this the flavour of the tales”, v. a. I have added elegance of style and many a poetical ornament, yet so that I have not deprived the tales of their power to express the *rasa*'s or sentiments aimed at.

This prefatory declaration of Somadeva is as true as it is modest. He displays in a high degree *l'art de faire un livre*. His narrative captivates both by its simple and clear, though very elegant, style and diction and by his skill in drawing with a few strokes pictures of types and characters taken from the real every-day life. Hence it is that even in the miraculous and fantastical facts and events that make up the bulk of the main story and of a great deal of the incidental tales the interest of the reader is uninterruptedly kept. His lively and pleasant art of story-telling — though now and then encumbered with inflatedness or vitiated by far-fetched false

et les passions (*rasas*)” (I.I. p. 219). This translation must be given up, as will be shown in the following chapter, as far as regards the meaning of *anvaya*.

<sup>1)</sup> I can do nothing better than quote Kṣemendra's definition of the term in his *Aucityavicarvarecā*, cl. 7 (ed. Kāvyaṁ. p. 116):

*ucitāñ prāhur acaryāḥ sadṛṣaṇi kila yasya yat;*  
*ucitasya ca yo bhāvas tad aucityaṇi pracakṣate.*

In the following clokas 8—10 he enumerates the many particular things to which *aucitya* is applicable.

wit<sup>1)</sup>, that drawback of so many Sanskrit literary high-style productions — is enhanced also by his native humour and the elegant and pointed sentences strewn about here and there with a good taste. One instance may exemplify the distance which separates in this respect the two abbreviators of the Br̥hatkathā. Vararuci relates to Çakatāla, how he got befriended with the Rākṣasa. With Kṣemendra as well as Somadeva this account takes up three çlokas. In the following columns Kṣ. is placed on the left, Som. on the right.

Br̥hkm. p. 22, 186—188

*daṇḍādhipatyam āśādyā  
rājñāham svayam arthitah |  
rakṣasā kālārupeṇa  
tenaiva niçi samgataḥ ||*  
*sa mām uvāca cakitam  
vañcanāyogravigrahah |  
rūpenābhyaadhikā nāri  
kā, satyam kathyatām iti ||*  
*yā yasyābhimatā loke.  
sā tasyādlīkarūpiyi |  
sa niçāmyeti madvākyam  
samtuṣṭo mitratām agāt ||*

Kathās. 5, 50—52

*tac chrutvā Yoganando mām  
akaron nagarādhipam |  
bhramamāç cāpacyam atrāham  
bhramantam rākṣasam niçi ||*  
*sa ca mām avadāt: brūhi  
vidyate nagare 'tra kā |  
surūpā strīti. tac chrutvā  
vihasyāham tam abravam ||*  
*yā yasyābhimatā mūrkha  
surūpā tasya sā bhavet |  
tac chrutvaiva twayaikena  
jito 'smity avadat sa mām ||*

<sup>1)</sup> In the lyrical parts of his narration European readers (not natives, of course) may be wearied now and then by his exuberance and accumulation of rhetorical show as in the beginning of tar. 14 and 18 (in Tawney's translation I, 94. 95; 125 f.); some of his puns may not be free from affectation — yet, upon the whole, such cases are rather exceptional, I think.

## APPENDIX.

List of necessary corrections from Lévi and Mańkowski to be  
made in the Bombay ed. of Br̥hatkathāmañjari.

---

- p. 2, ql. 15 Lévi: *sudhasindhug arbhā<sup>o</sup>*; — 3, ql. 24 L.: *pīyashasite*; — 4, ql. 42 L.: *akulita ciram*; — 8, ql. 22 L. (MS A): *vidya Varṣad dvijād vo'stu prāpyeti*; — 10, ql. 39 L. *hemalābhah sadā yasya*; — 11, ql. 49 *dhāvator adhiko vege*; — ql. 52 L. *prātāḥ satataṇi kāñcanapradāḥ*; — ql. 60 b L. *ardhāvṛttaniṣedhahuñkṛtipadām*; — p. 13, ql. 79 and where further on the word occurs *danḍapācikāḥ*<sup>1)</sup> for *danḍavāsikāḥ*; — 14, ql. 85 L. (MS A) *prastutapahnavaḥ pāpo*; — 16, ql. 112 L. *hemakoṭīm aham svayam*, cp. 113 d; — 19 ql. 145 L. *yo'yan cikharisāṇikācāḥ cākhaivalayasāṇikulaḥ*; — 20, ql. 157 L. *pratimāpaṭam adbhutam*, cp. Kathās. 5, 29; — ql. 161 L. *antahpurācrayān*; — ql. 169 L. (MS A) *cūcucur duḥkhasaṇitaptāḥ*; — 21, ql. 170 L. *Çakaṭālam: sakhe..... rakṣito bhavān*; — ql. 172 L. *tam adarçayām*; — ql. 177 *Çivavarmāpy acaṅkitāḥ*, cp. Kathās. 5, 69 foll.; — 23, ql. 207 *vadhvā* instead of *baddhvā*; — 24, ql. 214 *matvā* for *matyā*; — p. 26, ql. 9 L. has this necessary line added from MS. A between 9a and 9b *yāḥ cāpamokṣāṇi yuvayor darçanena vidhāsyati*; — ql. 41 *avijñatāmāyō vaidyaiḥ*; — 31, ql. 70 *mugdhamanasāṇi*; — 32, ql. 88 *budhāś tyajanty anāśadya*.
- p. 290, ql. 39 Lévi: *kṣmāpāḥ* instead of *laksyāḥ*; — p. 291, ql. 50 *bhrāntākampana<sup>o</sup>*; — p. 293, ql. 67 *maṭakah*; — ql. 72 *sphaṭikamandirāiḥ*; — p. 294, ql. 78 *vyākoçaphullavallīvanāṇi vanam*; — p. 295, ql. 90 *kimapy ātmopasūcakam*; — p. 299, ql. 149 *saprālāpāḥ prati paughaiḥ kurvāṇīm kranditair diçāḥ / asādyā rājaputraś tam*; — p. 301, ql. 166 *te yatajīvitām..... eakorāḥ cūcucur dvijāḥ*; — ql. 177 *vadanapratimācandraṁ*; — p. 302, ql. 182 *putrakāryāṇi*.
- p. 561, ql. 256 Mańkowski *surapuropāmam*. The ed. has *Mihilaropyā<sup>o</sup>* likewise p. 572, cl. 392 *Mī<sup>o</sup>*; — ql. 263 *vimārçasthagitatramāḥ*; — p. 562, ql. 269 *puraṇī..... yayuh*; — ql. 271 *sphātitastambhamastakat/karsan*; — p. 563, ql. 280 *prāyenā* (by conjecture) for *prahvenā*; — ql. 281 *duḥkhe* (by conj.) for *duḥkhaiḥ*; — ql. 283 *yad balasādhyām*; — p. 564, ql. 291 *vyālam* for *vyājam*; — ql. 293 *śimhas tam etya*; — ql. 296 *kāladaṇīṣṭrapāte*; — p. 565, ql. 303 *sadosekisvāmināḥ*; — p. 566, ql. 313 *dārpat so'nyān samabhāyetya*; — p. 568, ql. 336 *vipatprāptau*; — p. 569, ql. 356 *vikṣase*; — ql. 359 *vāsaraṇ..... durlakṣyāḥ* (a good conjecture); — p. 570, ql. 362 *katāḥ*; — p. 571, ql. 373 *tad vṛkṣasya ..... taduktair vyajayat param*; — ql. 374 *nudanīty abhāsata*; — ql. 378 *kulirakat*; — ql. 379 *arpaṇī..... mārgam*; —<sup>2)</sup> p. 573, ql. 404 *yāte kale*; — p. 574, ql. 413 *yantrārūḍhaṇi*; — p. 575, ql. 420 *yendham abhāraṇi dhr̥ṣṭas tat* (a good conj.); — ql. 425 *lubdhakatrasta ḍayayau..... sāraṅgāḥ*; — ql. 428 *deçakālajñatā kva te*; — p. 576, ql. 431 *mantharo 'pi*; — ql. 434 *cācintayan kṣaṇam*; — ql. 437 *Meghavarṇākhyāḥ*; — ql. 439 *sa*

<sup>1)</sup> Or *danḍapācakāḥ*. Both forms occur apud Lévi.

<sup>2)</sup> P. 573, ql. 395 I read *acodayat* for *anodayat* of both editions.

*sainyakṣayaçokārtah*..... *niyuktān yuktikovidan*; — ql. 440 *turṇam anyāḥ parākramam*; — p. 577, ql. 444 *tyaktaḥ sudurlabhaḥ*; — ql. 447 *ghatīa yān*; — ql. 451 *prasiddhyā caçino nāma* (a good conject., cp. Pañc. III, 82, ed. Bühler-Kielhorn); — p. 578, ql. 454 *sañjhṛṣo vatatārācū*; — ql. 455 *Vijayani* for *Vilayani*, cp. Kathās. 62, 32; — ql. 461 *veçmadānavivādināu* (a good conject.)<sup>1)</sup>; — p. 579, ql. 466 *parikṣayā*; — ql. 468 *skandhe taroñhaḥ*; — p. 580, ql. 486 *tulyakālāṇi*; — p. 581, ql. 489 *Arimārde*..... *kukānukroçālāni* (a good conject.); — ql. 490 *dhṛtā/lakṣmīḥ*, cp. ql. 367; — ql. 491 *vāñcyante*; — ql. 500 *tyaktodvāha* [or perhaps better *tyaktvadvāhanī*], the ed. Bomb. has here mere nonsense; — p. 582, ql. 506 *abhyañdhikām*; — ql. 510 *sañçvāsyā chidram durge*; — p. 583, ql. 519 *sadbhṛtyo vrddhasārasaḥ*<sup>2)</sup>; — ql. 521 *baddheśu* instead of *vrddheśu* and *tiṣṭhetā* for *tiṣṭhantu*; — p. 584, ql. 529 *palāñdumosam* (a good conject.); — p. 586, ql. 552 *āçāṇi vidiñaya bhāveśu yo hi bhāviṣu hṛṣyatī / salajjate saktughāṭam bhanītv eva svayam agrajaḥ*; — ql. 554 *kṛitvā* for *kṛtvā*; — p. 587, ql. 557 *kurvīta*; — ql. 558 *grhapoṣitam*; — ql. 562 *dṛṣṭeā* for *drasṭum*.

This list is of course limited to those cases, where evident corrections or the better readings from MSS have been overlooked by neglect of previous publications which no editor of the Br̥hat-kathāmañjarī ought to ignore. What inference is to be drawn from this as to the authority of the Bombay edition in the by far much greater part of the poem, where it is in fact the *editio princeps* in its fullest sense!

Inversely there are found sometimes a few better readings in the Bombay edition, adopted from the two mss. on which that edition is based. Lévi and Mańkowski did not find them in the mss. at their disposal. But the number of this kind of various readings is rather small and it is now no longer of utility to enumerate them. I only mention one instance: P. 1, ql. 3 *ghūkāḥ* is of course the right reading, not *dhūkāḥ*, as was edited by Lévi; *ghūka* ‘owl’ is not rarely met with in the Br̥hatkathām., e.g. p. 576, ql. 441 and p. 581, ql. 499.

<sup>1)</sup> *Purvaṇi* is to be corrected into *pūrva*, so that the whole becomes *pūrvaveçmadānavivādināu*.

<sup>2)</sup> Cf. 518 I correct thus: *vrddharākyāṇi hitāṇi rājaṇi chrotavyāṇi tat tvaya sada*.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE BRHATKATHA. ITS CONTENTS.

In the first chapter it has been shown that the conclusions drawn from a partial comparison in 1871 by Bühler as to the mutual relation of the poems of Kṣemendra and Somadeva as epitomes of the Br̥hatkathā are fully confirmed by a cross-examination of the two complete works. There can be not the least doubt about the existence in Kashmere in the eleventh century of that vast encyclopedia of tales in the Paiçācī dialect which is acknowledged as the common source of both Br̥hatkathāmañjarī and Kathāsarit-sāgara. Now the question arises, whether it is possible to resuscitate that old Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā with the help of its Sanskrit redactions.

Of course, only materially. Considering that Somadeva avowedly abridged his original and Kṣemendra tacitly, for he is silent about it, abridged it likewise and even much more, since his abstract is three times shorter than the Kathās., the impossibility of bringing back even for a small part its verbal form need no further demonstration. I have met with five lines common to both: Br̥hk. p. 173, 183 = Kath. t. 28, 182; the second part of Br̥hkm. 434, 9 and Kath. 104, 17; the çloka Br̥hkm. 496, 342 = Kath. 40, 21b, 22a. Here the presumption of their being taken from the Paiçācī original with no other alterations than those required by the change of dialect is very great, if we take into consideration that as a rule the concord of both collections of tales as to the contents, even in particulars, is as great as their discrepancy in wording and expression. The cases of their using the same special term or the same turn of phrase are comparatively rare, even when employing the same simile<sup>1)</sup>. In such cases, then, there is some probability that such a term and such a phrase are the Sanskrit equivalents of

<sup>1)</sup> E. g. in the king's answer to the Vetalā, at the conclusion of the 17<sup>th</sup> *vetāla*-story, bad princes who allow themselves to be led astray by their passions are compared to elephants in rut. Somadeva expresses this comparison by this çloka (91, 54): *rājānas tu madūdhamāta gajā iva nirañkuçah / chindanti dharmamaryādaçrñkhalañ viśayonmukhah*, Kṣemendra quite differently (p. 365, gl. 972): *uddimamadasaniruddha tilāmilitadrśṭayah / na cṛñvanti na paçyanti rājānah kuñjarā iva*.

corresponding Paiçācī expressions in the original. Of the kind are the epithet *vñdidviradakesari* of the great dialectician, the Bauddha monk Ratnacandramati in Br̥hkm. 253, 470 and Kath. 72, 93; the designation of the superintendent of the zenana, who is falsely named to the king as the lover of Guñavarā, by *antalpuropati* both in Br̥hkm. 491, 280 and in its parallel Kath. 39, 27; the old king of Āravastī is styled *pravayāḥ* both in Br̥hkm. 182, 291 and its parallel Kath. 30, 30. Likewise *triphalā* (Br̥hkm. 232, 204 cp. Kath. 70, 43), *homabhāṇḍa* (Br̥hkm. 233, 221 cp. Kath. 70, 70), *muktāttahāsa* (Br̥hkm. 308, 260 cp. Kath. 78, 2), *svasthāveṣa* (Br̥hkm. 232, 209 cp. Kath. 70, 56), *hatānekajana* (Br̥hkm. 133, 223 cp. Kath. 26, 173), *rūpadravīṇakāñkṣayā* Br̥hkm. 497, 348 cp. Kath. 40, 27), *açrukana* (Br̥hkm. 223, 95 *tatra* *neutrāt* *Trinetrasya patito* 'crukaṇaḥ kṣitau<sup>1)</sup> cp. Kath. 69, 38 80 [viz. Çiva] 'smāsu pravatesu akṣṇo daksīṇād açruṇaḥ kaṇam/ bhūmāv apātayat). The uniformity of utterance is hardly fortuitous here. In some other instances the common turn of phrase may point to the common source, the Paiçācī work, as is shown by the following juxtaposition:

Br̥hkm.	Kathās.
173, 191 <i>çrūyate mānuṣaiḥ sakhyam bhajanti kila devatāḥ pṛthvīpateḥ Pr̥thoh pūrvam putryā sakhyam Arundhati / bheje</i>	28, 191b <i>divyā yānti ca mānuṣibhir asamasnehāḥṛtāḥ samgatim / bheje kiṁ nr̥pateḥ Pr̥thos tana-yayā sakhyam na sĀrundhati?</i>
378, 1134 <i>ayam labdho 'si subhaga kva gamisyasi me puraḥ</i>	95, 74 <i>kva yāsi labdho 'si manyety īlapantī etc.</i>
386, 1239 <i>vāg uvācācaririnī</i>	100, 36 <i>tāvad vāg atra gaganād uccacārācaririnī</i>
393, 1320 <i>nabhasvatā / abhajyata pravahaṇam</i>	101, 141 <i>balīyasā/vātena tasyā vahanam hanyamānam abhajyata</i>
498, 361 <i>sa kadācin nijam dṛṣṭvā jarādhavalam īnanam satuṣāram ivāmbhojam abhic cintāgnitāpitah</i>	40, 45 <i>himāhatam ivāmbhojam palītamlānam īnanam darçayāmi katham devyai? hā dhīn me maranam varam.</i>
544, 44 <i>dhanvāham iti vādinīyā</i>	57, 77 <i>dhanvāsmīti vadantī ca</i>
553, 155 <i>chittvā sā karṇanāśikam/ tacchastreṇaiva sahasā prayayau tasya etc.</i>	58, 99 <i>tacchastreṇaiva baddhasya karṇanāśām cakarta sā.</i>

<sup>1)</sup> I quote according to the reading of MS अ, registered in the foot-note; the reading adopted by the editors is obviously a false one.

Yet, upon the whole, these coincidences are not frequent, and even if they were more numerous than they are, the profit to be obtained from a systematic and exhaustive exploration of them would be small. It is not difficult to put a Paiçācī garb on those words and turns of phrase which it would be made probable that are borrowed by the Sanskrit redactors from the original Paiçācī poem. By applying the scanty rules laid down by the grammarians how to make Paiçācī from Çaurasenī or from Sanskrit (see PISCHEL, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen* p. 27—29; p. 138) it may be taken for granted that in the Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā the words *vātiddirathakesari*, *anteurapati*, *pavayo*, *tiphalā*, *homaphāndam*, *muttāttahāso*, *hatānekacano*, *sattahāveso* etc. occurred, but this result is meagre. PISCHEL, as early as 1874, in his „dissertatio inauguralis” *de grammaticis Prācriticis*, putting together the Paiçācī quotations by Hemacandra in the last chapter of the 8<sup>th</sup> book of his grammar, expressed as his opinion that they are borrowed from the Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā (see p. 33 of that dissertation). This is very probable, indeed; yet, the smallness of the few fragments and the circumstance that they consist of some general phrases not applicable to a certain fact or story related in the Br̥hatkathā forbids to identify them with corresponding passages in the Sanskrit redactions.

A trace of the origin of the work is found in a few proper names. Kṣemendra and Somadeva, though as a rule, of course, there is conformity in this respect, are not rarely at variance; the one calls somebody e.g. Samudradatta, who is called Sainudramatsya by the other; in this way there are a many slight discrepancies, as Yajñaketu (Kṣ.) Yaçahketu (S.), Dhanadatta (Kṣ.) Dhanapāla (S.), Madanamañjarī (Kṣ.) Madanasundarī (S.), etc. etc. Sometimes Kṣemendra prefers a shorter form of the name; the hero of the main story is called throughout Naravāhana<sup>1)</sup>, not Naravāhanadatta, as he is invariably named by Somadeva, and Muktā(or Mukta)-ketu and Muktadhvaja (Kṣ. p. 443 and 449) correspond to the Muktāphalaketu and Muktāphaladhvaja of the seventeenth lambaka of Somadeva. Now, in a few instances it is plain that Kṣemendra's names have retained their Paiçācī shape, whereas Somadeva sanskritized them. Of the kind are Kāmpilya (Kathās. 25, 23) and Kāmpilla (Br̥hk. 120, cl. 73), Potraka (K. 67, 6) and Pota (B. 209, cl. 6); Tejasvatī, a name occurring thrice in the Kathās. for three different ladies (18, 77. 30, 72. 45, 177) is Tejovatī in Br̥hkathm.

<sup>1)</sup> Even Naravāha (p. 474, cl. 68; p. 502 cl. 415 and 418). P. 221, 70 *Naravāhana*, as is edited, is to be corrected into *Naravāha* for a metrical reason.

(p. 84, cl. 187, p. 183, 302) <sup>1)</sup>, Rādhā (K. 74, 29) and Rāthā (B. 279, cl. 783), Vakrolaka (K. 93, 3) and Vaṇkolaka (B. 369, cl. 1014), Thinthākarāla (K. 122, 71) and Thenthākarāla (B. 122, 71). BÜHLER, in his article in the *Ind. Ant.* (I, p. 309) noticed this point already, yet his statement is to be corrected in this, that both S. and Kṣ. agree in the name of Dīpakarṇī; Durgaprasād's ed. has this form, not Dvīpak., as is edited by Brockhaus. Another trace of the original language may be left in the false form of the name Pāravatākṣa (the Nāga who dispersed Mṛgāṇkadatta and his comrades) which is read Br̥hkm. p. 232, cl. 210: *Nāgo Pāravatākhyo 'sti bhavane hamsasūcīte*; since the right name appears cl. 224, it is probable that Kṣemendra who worked in a hurry misunderstood the first time the meaning of Paiç. *pāravatakkho*, but sanskritized it better afterwards <sup>2)</sup>.

It is of greater importance to examine how much a close comparison of the two Sanskrit redactions may afford in the way of reconstituting the scheme and the arrangement of the old Br̥hatkathā.

It has been shown in the First Chapter (*supra*, p. 15 and 16) that the Kathāsaritsāgara and the Br̥hatkathāmañjarī agree in the number and the titles of the different lambakas but, after lambaka V, disagree in the order of them, even to a considerable degree. Which of the two represents the original Br̥hatkathā? Or perhaps neither?

As far as I know, the question has not been examined before. Of the Sanskrit scholars who occupied themselves with the Kathāsaritsāgara, Mańkowski alone, I believe, expressed an opinion on this point. P. IX of the „Einleitung“ of his work on the Pañcātantra portions in Kath. and Br̥hkm., mentioned above (p. 12 n. 2), he says: „Wie aus der Zusammenstellung bei Lévi zu ersehen ist, ist die Reihenfolge der ersten fünf Bücher bei Somadeva genau dieselbe wie bei Kshemendra; nur die übrigen dreizehn Bücher sind bei beiden anders geordnet. Ich glaube daher, dass Somadeva in V. 11 [of his tr. 1, vide *supra*, p. 22] unzweideutig erklärt, dass er in diesem Theile seines Gedichts die Anordnung des Stoffes im

<sup>1)</sup> But Kathās. 17, 34 Somadeva retained Tejovatī just as he found it in the Paiçāci Br̥hatkathā; the corresponding verse apud Kṣemendra is p. 79 cl. 126.

<sup>2)</sup> The name Karmasena in the Kathās. (t. 69 and 112) of the father of Çāgañkavatī, the sweetheart of Mṛgāṇkadatta, is Kandarpasena in the Br̥hkm. (see p. 222, cl. 85. p. 402, cl. 8). The original had either Kamasena, which being written with anusvāra + m, may have induced Kṣemendra in his negligent way to accept it as Kāmasena, or it was Somadeva who misread the name Kāmasena, if the long a was denoted in his MS. of Br̥hatkathā by a small curve above the aksara, which he read as r before consonant.

Original geändert hat. Hätte er sich genau an seine Vorlage gehalten, wie könnte er da von Rücksicht auf den Zusammenhang und von einem Ordnen reden? Für meine Erklärung spricht auch der Umstand dass ein paar Geschichten sich bei Somadeva wiederholen.... Ob diese Wiederholungen sich nicht auch bei Kshemendra finden, kann ich leider nicht ermitteln; ich glaube jedoch, dass dieselben in Guṇādhyas Brihatkathā nicht vorhanden waren und Somadeva zuzuschreiben sind, dem eine solche Unachtsamkeit bei einer Umarbeitung seiner Vorlage nur zu leicht zustossen konnte. Dass die fünf Bücher des Pañcatantra bei Kshemendra zusammenhängen, bei Somadeva dagegen durch andere Geschichten von einander getrennt sind, werden wir später sehen. Auch hierin hat, wie ich glaube, Kshemendra das Ursprüngliche bewahrt".

I have transcribed in full his argument that I might the better refute it. I begin to observe that Mańkowski judged upon unsufficient documents; he knew Somadeva, but was little informed of the contents of the Br̥hatkathāmañjarī, which was an ineditum at the time he wrote. Further, he discredits the carefulness of Somadeva without sufficient reason; the so called want of diligence appearing in the fact of his relating the same story repeatedly is a mere fancy, and supposed he had somehow founded this charge by argument, it would fail to account for a so great number of repetitions of the same tales, as really occur in the Kathās. And in the Br̥hkm., too, though not so often; for e. g. the story of Jimūtavāhana is twice told and at great length in Kathās. t. 22 and t. 90, likewise in the Br̥hkm. p. 107 f. and 353 f., the first part of the narration of Anaṅgarati in Kathās. t. 52 reappears with the same names in t. 83, but also in Br̥hkm. p. 326 and p. 518<sup>1)</sup>). Therefore, from all that which is alleged by Mańkowski, there remains but one point of importance, whether he is right stating that Somadeva himself intimates that he had arbitrarily arranged the materials he took from the Br̥hatkathā. Here I think he has misunderstood his text.

The statement of Somadeva alluded to, is found in the preamble of his book, t. 1, 11 *aucityānvayarakṣā ca* etc. We have dealt with this cloka *supra*, p. 22 and 23, where we translated *aucityānvaya* by „the being provided with appropriateness”. Somadeva declares that he endeavoured to keep intact in his work the good quality of his original of representing things and persons with appropriated words

<sup>1)</sup> P. 518, gl. 102 *tasyĀnaṅgarati nāma*, as is edited, must be corrected into *tasyĀnaṅgaratir nāma*; in gl. 114 the right form of the name has remained intact.

and in the proper and suitable way, accordingly as they ought to be represented, in short he praises implicitly the picturesque faithfulness of the stories as they are narrated in the Paiçācī Brhatkathā and shows his care to preserve that virtue in his Sanskrit redaction. He does however state nothing about their arrangement. Lévi, and after him Mańkowski, were wrong in accepting *anvaya* with that meaning and in taking *aucityānvaya* for a dvandva compound. *Anvaya* has several acceptations, but it never means „order, due order, arrangement”; since it may express also the interrelation of words in a sentence, viz. their being construed together, and since it is used for this reason in commentaries as a technical term to denote such „construction,” — which employment is duly registered in the *Petropolitan Dictionary* s. v. 6) and in the *Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung* s. v. 4 — I suppose, this was the starting point of Lévi’s wrong inference that *anvaya* may also signify „due order, arrangement” in a more general sense. No Hindoo, I think, will employ it with this meaning. APTĒ in his *English-Sanskrit Dictionary* translates „arrangement” by *racanā*, *vinyāsa*, *samvidhā*, *vyūhana*, *kramena sthāpana*, *paripāti*, *krama* — but not by *anvaya*; nor is *anvaya* found among the Sanskrit equivalents of „order,” the only case he mentions is to translate Engl. „the natural order of words”<sup>1)</sup>.

The assumed avowal of Somadeva as to his arrangement of the tales being different from that of the Paiçācī Brhatkathā must, therefore, be put aside. It does not exist at all. Those who believed in its existence were mistaken by an erroneous translation. I think we are nearer to the truth, if from the introductory declaration of Somadeva to his readers, taking it as a whole, we draw the conclusion, that he, on the contrary, faithfully kept the arrangement of the work on which he put a Sanskrit garb: *yathā mūlāṇi tathaivaitan na manāg apy atikramah*. And perhaps the very decidedness of this profession, united with the explicit statement made in the subsequent verses, may be accounted for by his propensity to make front against his predecessor in sanskritizing the Brhatkathā, who had fallen short of his duty of making a faithful reproduction of it. As a matter of fact, Kṣemendra does not name the source of his Brhatkathāmañjari. After the usual invocations his preamble is made up of this single çloka:

*evam kila purāneṣu sarvāgamavidhāyiṣu  
viçvaçāsanaçālinyāṇi çrutau ca çruyate kathā,*

<sup>1)</sup> It results from this also that in the *Petropolitan Dictionary* s.v. *anvaya* the meaning 5) supposed for this single passage Kathās. 1, 11 must be cancelled.

a mere phrase which discloses nothing, as the author only affirms that the great tale he is about to narrate is not of his own invention. It is found in the Purāṇas and the Vedas, so he says! A strange statement and a deceptive one moreover, which permits us also to suppose that he took no scruple to act with his poem rather freely and according to his fancy. The résumé of the books VI—XVIII (p. 617—619) which is put into the mouth of Naravāhana himself and which has no counterpart in the Kathāsaritsāgara, is doubtless of his own invention.

By reasoning a priori, therefore, one would be rather inclined to distrust the faithfulness of the arrangement of the lambakas of the Br̥hatkathāmañjari. But why should we reason upon generalities, while evidence of a better kind may be obtained by a close comparison of the two sets of books that make up: one the redaction of Somadeva, and the other that of Kṣemendra? Which of them will prove to afford the better and the more congruous and consistent course of facts, as far as they belong to the frame-story, will have the better claim to be acknowledged as representative of the original order.

The first five lambakas following each other in the same order in both poems, we must begin with lamb. VI. This lambaka and the next ones are thus far arranged differently, that lamb. VI of Somadeva is the VII<sup>th</sup> of Kṣemendra, whereas lamb. VIII of S. corresponds to VI of Kṣ. Lamb. VIII S. = VI Kṣ. is wholly taken up with an episode, the story of Sūryaprabha. The only difference is this: Kṣemendra subjoins it to the similar story of Çaktivēga, which makes up lamb. V, he represents both narrations as being told by two Vidyādharaś at different times to Udayana, when Naravāhanadatta was an infant; Somadeva makes Vajraprabha narrate the story of the old Cakravartin Sūryaprabha at a much later time, when Naravāhana was already married and heir apparent. This discrepancy is of no consequence at all and does not yield any presumption in favour of either author.

But the case is different with respect to the lambaka „Ratnaprabhā” which bears the number VII in the Kathāsaritsāgara = XIV of the Br̥hatkathāmañjari. That lambaka encompasses a portion of the main story, as far as it relates how Naravāhanadatta got his wives Ratnaprabhā and Karpūrikā. Somadeva places these events in the earlier part of the hero's adventures, Kṣemendra in a much later period, when he had gained already victories in the celestial regions, had recovered his chief queen Madanamañcukā and was very near to be crowned emperor of all the Vidyādharaś. It is not

difficult to show that Kṣ.'s division is not consistent with the regular course of the facts. The lambaka Ratnaprabhā presupposes the heir apparent living with his father at Kaučāmbī and his being dependent on him; he has not yet obtained the powers of the Vidyā-dharas; his falling in love with the Vidyādhari Ratnaprabhā affords the first opportunity to him to be raised into the higher spheres; his love with Karpūrikā concerns a human lady, and it is only by means of a mechanical implement wrought by a human magician that he passes through the air to her distant country and comes back with her home. These facts are properly put between lamb. „Madanamañcukā” (Somadeva's VI)<sup>1)</sup>, treating of how he got his first wife, and lamb. „Alaṅkāravatī,” in which he gains his second Vidyādhari (Somadeva's IX) and becomes more and more familiarized with the spheres on high. But being inserted, as Kṣemendra does, after the lambaka „Pañca” (Somadeva's XIV = Kṣ.'s XIII) these facts are utterly discordant. Nor is this arrangement suitable with respect to the lambaka next in Kṣemendra, which is Alaṅkāravatī; it destroys the natural connexion and coherence of lamb. „Pañca” and lamb. „Mahābhiseka” (Som.'s XIV and XV), the victory of the hero and his being anointed as the Cakravartin of the Vidyādhara.

Kṣ.'s lamb. VIII is „Velā,” which is lamb. XI of Somadeva. In this book, a very short one, Narav. obtains as his wife Jinen-drasenā (Kṣ.) or Jayendrasenā (Som.), the sister of the two brothers who chose him to pass the judgment of their contest. By fixing the time of that marriage next to his marriage with his first queen Madanamañcukā Kṣemendra raises the lady to a higher rank than is consistent with the intention of the author of the Br̥hatkathā, who evidently considered Ratnaprabhā, and no other woman, as the second queen; the relation of the father to Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī has its parallel in that of the son to Madanamañcukā and Ratnaprabhā. Here too, it is plain, Kṣemendra's arrangement of the order of events is rather anomalous.

The lamb. „Pañca” is almost entirely concerned with the frame-story. In the Kathāsaritsāgara, of which it is the XIV<sup>th</sup> lamb., it begins with the rape of Madanamañcukā and the desolation of her husband at her loss; the various adventures connected with his inquiries after her and the endeavours taken to release her from the hands of Mānasavega are narrated in this book. Kṣemendra's

---

<sup>1)</sup> Som. 's lamb. VIII „Sūryaprabha” is a mere episode, and does not belong to the frame-story; cp. *supra*, p. 7.

XIII<sup>th</sup> book „Pañca” has exactly the same contents, with one exception: the rape of Madanamañcukā is not told there, nor could it be told at this point of the tale, since this occurrence was related in an earlier portion of the tale, at the conclusion of the lamb. „Velā.” In other words: Kṣ. makes Mānasavega kidnap the chief queen of Naravāhanadatta soon after his marrying his second wife, whereas Som. postpones the capture to a much later period of his exploits. Both the rape and the *faits et gestes* performed by the future Emperor of the Vidyādhara to recover his beloved one are related without interruption in the Kathāsaritsāgara, within the limits of one lambaka. In the Br̥hatkathāmañjari Madanamañcukā is stolen away in lamb. VIII, and not regained before the poem has almost completed lamb. XIII. The importance of this discrepancy becomes striking, if we consider that the intermediate lambakas, one of which „Çaçāñkavati” (Kṣ.’s nr. IX) numbers 2435 çlokas, are crammed with a great mass of stories of the most various kind, which intercept the main story. It is obvious even to a superficial observer that the arrangement of Somadeva is more suitable for a proper exposition of this part of the tale.

Moreover, Kṣemendra fixing the capture of Madanamañcukā at a prior time involves himself into incongruities and impairs the reputation of his hero. When the Vidyādhara Mānasavega carried her off through the air, he had ravished her from her apartments in the palace of Kauçāmbī. In this point both Sanskrit redactions are in accordance. Her disappearance could in no way be hidden from the father of Naravāhanadatta, the lord of Kauçāmbī. But in the Br̥hatkathāmañjari the rape is narrated in lamb. VIII (p. 214 f.), yet it is as late as the commencement of lamb. XIII (p. 450) that Udayana is informed of his son’s distress and of his absence in search of her! <sup>1)</sup> Kṣ. had forgotten that Madanamañcukā was seized at Kauçāmbī, from the immediate vicinity of her father-in-law.

The lamb. „Çaçāñkavatī”, which in Br̥km. — where it is nr. IX — is subsequent to the disappearance of Madanamañcukā, opens with the nocturnal visit of Lalitalocanā who carries the hero while asleep away to a far off hill, desirous of his embraces. In the mean while Naravāhanadatta awoke, and seeing the beautiful heavenly maiden at his side, „the cunning prince pretended to be asleep,

<sup>1)</sup>

atrāntare kvāpi yātāṇi punah prāptam athātmajam  
drṣṭvā lebhe ratiṇi viro Vatsarājāḥ priyāsakhaḥ || Pañca,  
tāṇi vallabhāviyogārtāṇi jñātvā Vatsanareṣvaraḥ  
babhāva saha devibhyām cokapāvakamārchipātāḥ || ql. 2.

In ql. 2 I have corrected the nonsensical reading of the edited text: lobharatiṇi.

and in order to test her, he said, as if talking in his sleep: „Where are you, dear Madanamañcukā? Come and embrace me”<sup>1)</sup>. Whereupon she took the form of that queen and complied to his wish. Now, both authors agree about the attitude of the prince at that moment; he knows the woman who has taken him into her arms to be another than his most beloved queen, but he feigns it is she, in order to prompt her to give him her caresses. This agreement evidently shows, that the fact was related in this manner in their common source, the Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā. But how different are the circumstances in both Sanskrit redactions! Somadeva simply relates the witty trick of a wanton youth, enjoying the *bonne fortune* of a new love-adventure; Kṣemendra strikes the reader with the disgusting heartlessness of his hero, who just now was bereaved of his most beloved wife and in the acme of his grief employs her cherished name as an instrument for indulging into lasciviousness!

Theforesaid considerations induce me to conclude that it was Somadeva, and not Kṣemendra, who drew up the faithful reproduction of the old Paiçācī poem. That he tells sometimes the same story twice over, now and then even with slight variations, may be put rather on the account of his fidelity in rendering the work he wished to preserve than on that of the „Unachtsamkeit” fancied by Mańkowski. Who knows both, cannot but feel convinced that negligence is not a fault of Somadeva but rather of his predecessor. And for what reason should we mistrust the explicit declaration made in the opening verses of the Kathāsaritsāgara? On the other hand it is *a priori* to be expected that Kṣemendra, not having obliged himself to reproduce in a Sanskrit imitation the Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā exactly and in the same order, reserved and retained his freedom for change and modification according to his own taste. It is in consequence of *his* predilection for regular schemes that the adventures and exploits of the two human persons who obtained power in the world of the Vidyādharaś: Çaktivega and Sūryaprabha, are narrated in the Br̥hatkathāmañjarī in immediate order in two subsequent lambakas; the same tendency induced him to put together into one body the tales of the Pañcatantra (p. 561—587 of the printed text), though in the poem he worked upon he found the several books separated from each other by interposed small stories of a quite different kind. Here and elsewhere it is not he, but Somadeva who retained the old divisions of the Br̥hatkathā.

<sup>1)</sup> I quote Tawney's translation (II, p. 133) of Kathās. 68, 10.

The rightness of this view is confirmed by the following fact. In several cases it is almost certain or at least probable that Kṣemendra modified details which he found in the Br̥hatkathā, if in some other source within his reach the same story was related in a somewhat different manner more conformable to his own taste. So it is well-nigh proved by J. HERTEL, *Ueber das Tantrākhyāna, die kaśmīrische Rezension des Pañcatantra*<sup>1)</sup>, that his epitome of the Pañcatantra (lamb. XVI, cl. 256—566) contains many indications of his having made use of that redaction of the renowned book by side with its reproduction in Guṇāḍhya's Br̥hatkathā. It is from the former work that he took the name of the town Mihilāropya (cl. 256 and 392) which is not found in Somadeva, but occurs in the Tantrākhyāyika, being likewise written *Mihilā*<sup>o</sup> (cp. Hertel, p. 118). It is by misunderstanding the description of the spectacle afforded to the eyes of the people, when the tortoise was being carried away through the air seizing with his teeth a piece of wood the ends of which were caught by two swans, that Kṣemendra writes *çakatākr̥tim* (cl. 334) — his source has: *kim idam çakatacakrapramāṇam viyatā niyata iti* (l. 735 of Hertel's ed.), cp. Hertel, p. 109. Nor is it likely that the fable of the sly jackal Caturaka (cl. 348 foll.) was contained in the Br̥hatkathā; it is not met with in Kathāsaritsāgara, but occurs in Tantr. l. 759 foll. The same may apply to the stories of the crow and the serpent, of the blue jackal, and of the camel who was compelled to sacrifice his body to the lion. Cp. also Hertel's note on p. 132.

The Vetāla-stories are no less popular in India than the fables of the Pañcatantra. They, too, have come to us in many redactions. Kṣemendra composing the Vetāla portion of the Br̥hatkathā, must have taken his materials not from Guṇāḍhya's poem alone, but have availed himself also of other redactions. Certainly he took delight in the old Vetālapañcavimçatikathās. He is more extensive in this part of his poem than he is wont to be and did not abridge them to that kind of skeleton as to which he reduced the old Pañcatantra. His epitome of the Vetāla tales numbers 1203 clokas (from IX, 18, p. 289 — to IX, 1221, p. 385 of the edited text), whereas no more than 308 make up the sum of his Pañcatantra portion. The arrangement of the tales is slightly different in Kathās. and in Br̥hatkm.; both agree as to nr. 1—4, but Kṣem. nr. 5 = Som. nr. 8; Kṣem. nr. 6, 7, 8 = Som. nr. 5, 6, 7; from nr. 9 they are again

<sup>1)</sup> This important dissertation (Leipzig, Teubner 1904), which contains also the oldest redaction of Pañcatantra known to us, is XXII, nr. 5 of the *Abhandlungen der phil. hist. Klasse der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*.

in accordance. Now, nr. 5 of Kṣem. is also nr. 5 in Jīvānanda's edition of the *Vetālapañcavimçati*<sup>1)</sup>, the story of the three fastidious brothers. After all which has been exposed above, I hold it for certain that it was Kṣemendra, and not Somadeva, who changed the order of the tales as they were extant in the Br̥hatkathā, and who modified some details. With him, Vīravara's devotion to Hari and Hara is double as expensive as in the Kathās. (cp. Br̥km. p. 310, 282 f. with Kathās. 78, 16—18); it is he who added the getting with child of Çāçiprabhā in tale nr. 15 (p. 347, cl. 747 and p. 349 cl. 760); in tale nr. 17 the person of Virāja, to whom the king avows his being in love, is not found in Kathās.; in nr. 18, when Candrasvāmin after submerging into the river, experiences another life-existence, the events of that submarine life are full of particularities, which are not met with in the correspondent part of Kathās. (cp. Kathās. 92, 65—67 with Br̥km. p. 367, cl. 992—999) but which occur also in nr. 15 of Jīvānanda's edition (p. 52 f.); the third vetāla, in Kṣemendra's poem, contains likewise sundry details not found in Kathās. Vet. nr. 3, and extends over 76 clokas (p. 302, 184—308, 259). This diversity in some respects is utterly contrasting with the great conformity as to the transitions of one number of the *Vetāla*-tales to another, e.g. the transition of tale nr. 3 to nr. 4.

Br̥km. p. 308, cl. 260 : <i>muktāttahāsam ādāya tatas tam gatasam̄bhramah / yayau javena nrpatih . skandhasthah so 'py abhāṣata   </i> 261 : <i>mohah prthvīpate ko' yam tavāpi hr̥di j̥mbhate / duṣṭaçra- maṇasam̄parkād yat prāpto 'si mahīm imām   </i> 262 : <i>anāyāsam hi pātheyam yatheṣṭam kathānam pathi /</i>	Kathās. 78, 2 : <i>labdhvā muktāttahāsam tam Ve- tālam nr̥carīragam / niṣkampah skandham āropya tūṣṇīm uda- calat tatah   </i> 3 : <i>calantam ca tam amśastho Vetālah so 'bravīt punah / rājan kubhikṣor etasya kr̥te ko 'yam tava çramah   </i> 4 : <i>āyāse niṣphale 'muṣmin viveko bata nāsti te tad imām çr̥nu mattas tvam kathām pathi vinodinīm   </i>
--	--

Therefore, where this conformity is broken by Kṣ. producing more and somewhat different details, we may as a rule suppose

<sup>1)</sup> A very bad edition of an epitome of the work, made by a certain Jambhaladatta. Cp. UHLE in his Preface (p. XV) on his edition of Çivadasa's *Vetālapañcavimçatikā* (*Abh. f. die Kunde des Morgenlandes herausg. v. d. D. Morgenl. Ges.* VIII, nr. 1).

that he made use there of other sources besides the Br̥hatkathā.

The old epic legend of Nala and Damayantī is told in the 56<sup>th</sup> tar. of the Kathāsaritsāgara, ql. 238—417, the corresponding passage in Br̥hkm. (p. 537, ql. 331—540, ql. 371) amounts to  $\frac{2}{9}$  of its length. Yet it mentions the boons, given by the devas at Nala's marriage (ql. 342), which detail is passed over by Somadeva. The very words, which Kṣ. uses here:

*chāyādvitiyam avṛṇot pariññāya Nalam dhiyā.  
jñātvā devāḥ svam ākāram vidhāya pradadur varām*

show that he availed himself of the original Mahābhārata tradition, too, not only of the Br̥hatkathā<sup>1)</sup>. For this reason, too, he avoided to state that she saw six Nalas, as he found in the Paiçacī poem, contrarily to the Mhbh.; the Nalopākhyāna, adhy. 5, 9 has „five” Nalas<sup>2)</sup>; Kṣ. does not name any number at all. Nor did he find in the Br̥hatkathā, that Puṣkara was a relative to Nala, not a brother (*sagotrenātha cātrunā / kenāpi Puṣkarākhyena*), which is also different from the Mhbh.; I do not understand, for what reason he may have modified this, and am rather inclined to suspect some neglect of his part.

Another instance of Kṣemendra's freedom in handling his groundwork. The story of Purūravas and Urvacī is told in both Sanskrit versions. In the Kathās. (17, 4) Purūravas is called *parama Vaiṣṇava*, and from the whole style and spirit of the story of his adventures it is plain that the version of the Br̥hatkathā is founded on a Viṣṇuitic recension of the old myth. Kṣemendra stripped off entirely that Vaiṣṇava garb, and in his short extract (lamb. III, 114—123) he purposely does not even mention the name of Viṣṇu, though this god plays an *essential* part in the story as told by Somadeva.

Elsewhere Kṣemendra, who loved to show his learning, gratifies himself in additional ornaments of a rather ostentatious character. If such accessories are not found at all in the parallel passages of Kathās. and at the same time display that the poet was well read in the great epics and the purāṇa literature, it is likely that he has added them of his own. Of the kind is this. Bhīmabhaṭa is

<sup>1)</sup> The force of this argument will be felt by every one who, perusing the Nala episode in the Kathās., observes how much its composer strove to keep a wording different from that of the famous epic tale.

<sup>2)</sup> In Kathās. 56, 260—280 the narration of the wooing of Damayantī by the Devas is a paraphrase of the simpler account in Mhbh. It differs in this, that *five* lokapālās, not *four*, come up to the *svayamvara*, Vāyu being added to Indra, Agni, Varuṇa and Yama, see ql. 261.

changed into an elephant owing to a curse of a hermit whom he had treated with contempt. In Kathās. (74, 305) that hermit's name Uttāṅka is simply mentioned, nothing more. Kṣemendra does not omit to identify him with the Uttāṅka of the Ādiparva of the Mhbh. (see p. 286, cl. 872).

To infer from all this that where soever, with respect to the contents of the corresponding tales, Kṣemendra is at variance with Somadeva, he has modified them either from other sources or by his own invention, would be, however, a very hazarded conclusion and rather an untruth. Since both abridged a voluminous ground-text independently, it cannot have failed to happen that some details passed over by one were drawn up by the other, even while taking into account that the result of Kṣemendra's condensing effort was the production of a poem much smaller than that of Somadeva<sup>1)</sup>. BÜHLER, in his first article mentioned above p. 11, demonstrated already that variance in particularities may, and in some cases, must be explained so. I may point to the fact that Kṣemendra avoids more than the author of Kathās. introducing anonymous persons; he has a childish liking for the proper names of the dramatis personae of his numerous tales, nor is it anything rare with him that, within shorter limits, he mentions names of secondary persons not found in the corresponding parties of Somadeva<sup>2)</sup>.

Recapitulating, we may state as the main result of the comparison of the two Sanskrit redactions this, that Somadeva's poem may be considered to give a faithful representation of the old Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā, but that on the other hand the differences between him and Kṣemendra are not always to be imputed to the latter having contaminated the tradition of the Br̥hatkathā with traits and

<sup>1)</sup> So it is impossible that the details of the story told Br̥hkm. p. 406, cl. 57. 58, but passed over Kathās. 123, 340, did not belong to the Br̥hatkathā. In Kathās. 105, 68 it is simply said that it was in her old father's hermitage that Vegavati succeeded in getting the *vidyās*, denegated to her by her brother; Br̥hkm. p. 453, cl. 44—49 contains a detailed account how this came to happen. Whence else could Kṣ. draw this than from the Br̥hatkathā? And the agreement mentioned by Kṣem. (p. 168, cl. 122) *kasi ti pracchanyāhanī na rājann iti sañvidā*, as it is doubtless an essential feature of the story of Suṣeṇa and Rambhā, goes back to the Paiçācī original, though Som. did not retain it in his version (t. 28, 60 foll.).

<sup>2)</sup> To give a few instances out of a large list. Kṣ. names — Som. not so — the mother of Črutadbi; the yoginī who taught the pseudo-Hanṣāvalī an incantation against the fever-demon; the wife of Jimūtaketu; the king of Ujjayinī in the preamble of the story of Niçeyadatta; the maiden, whom İçvaraçarman married at last. Cp. Br̥hkm. p. 231, 196. 246, 380. 349, 768. 481, 153. 547, 79. with Kathās. 70, 31. 71, 207. 90, 6—9. 37, 3. 57, 175. A remarkable name is that of the captain of the ship: Barbara; it does not occur in Somadeva's relation of the singing nixe (t. 86, 77 foll.).

particulars taken from other redactions of the same stories or to his having given free play to his own fancy. Sometimes he may have done so, yet he kept sometimes peculiarities originally belonging to the Br̥hatkathā which Somadeva left aside. Sound inquiry must decide thereabout in each separate case; not rarely, I fear, its conclusion will be a *non liquet*. But, be this as it may, there is not the least reason to distrust the categorical declaration of the author of the Kathāsaritsāgara, that his shortened Br̥hatkathā in Sanskrit is the faithful reproduction of the Paiçācī poem, without detracting or adding to its contents. It was he who kept the original order of the lambakas and not Kṣemendra. The different arrangement of the latter is to be ascribed to some caprice. And so the final conclusion of our general inquiry tends to confirm, if not to enlarge the value of the Kathāsaritsāgara as the trustworthy testimony of that immense mass of fairy tales which was collected many centuries before the eleventh A. D. and as a faithful picture of Indian society at the time, when that collection was made.

In 1893 the existence of a third Sanskrit *samgraha* of the Br̥hatkathā was made known. The pandit Hara Prasād Shāstri in an article of the *Journal of the As. Soc. of Bengal* (LXII, 245 foll.) gave an account of the contents of a MS, he had received through the good offices of some friend from Nepal among a collection of old and fragmentary Sanskrit literary documents. That MS, nr. 12 of his list, was labelled as unknown, but on examination he discovered it to be a portion of a Sanskrit redaction of the Br̥hatkathā, much different from both Somadeva's and Kṣemendra's, and in his opinion a more extensive work than even the former of both. To give an idea of the length of the whole, he noticed that the first adhyāya alone, distributed over 26 sargas, has more than 4200 clokas, which portion he estimated „about a tenth of the whole work”. It is not divided, so he said, into lambakas and taraṅgas, but into adhyāyas and sargas. He added in full the colophons of the different sargas extant in the fragment he had discovered. This valuable statement must be corrected in one point, as has been observed by dr. Hertel, in the Preface of his edition of the meridional redaction of Pañcatantra<sup>1)</sup>, p. XII—XVIII; Hara Prasād had misunderstood the meaning of *adhyāya*, occurring but once and without the addition of *prathama* in the colophons. Our fragment knows no other division but into sargas;

<sup>1)</sup> *Abh. der Sächs. Ges. der Wiss., Phil. Hist. Cl.* XXIV, nr. 5.

the word *adhyāya* is not the name of some portion of the poem. The title of the whole, as found in the colophons, is *Bṛhatkathāyām çlokasaṅgraha* = „the abstract in çlokas (called) Bṛhatkathā”.

Five years after, Sylvain Lévi returning from Nepal took to Paris another manuscript of the same work, more exactly speaking, a second MS which contains a portion of the text, brought into light by Hara Prasād, sarga 1—10 out of the 26. Though this acquisition did not extend the compass of the remnants of the third Sanskrit Bṛhatkathā, it drew the attention to that work. One of Lévi's pupils, M. FÉLIX LACÔTE, to whom he intrusted the study of it and in whose behalf he obtained the loan of the Calcutta MS described by Hara Prasād, is now preparing an edition. He has already published in original and translation the first sarga in the *Journal Asiatique* of 1906 (Janv.—Févr. p. 22 foll.) and in the general account he gives of the work, he fully subscribes to the judgment of the first discoverer. „Nous avons affaire à un poème complètement différent”, if compared with the common source of the two Kashmirian abbreviators. As far as may be inferred from the fragment available, not only „la disposition des matières”, but also „en grande partie, les matières mêmes sont tout autres”. The first sarga certainly has a content not found at all in the Kathāsaritsāgara nor in the Bṛhatkathā-mañjarī, and even not consistent with what is related in a few çlokas of Kathās. (111, 81. 90—93) about Gopālaka's abdication and depart to the forest. And the examination of the colophons communicated by Hara Prasād sometimes brings us in contact with names and facts known from Kathās. and Brhkm., as the story of Piṅgalikā (Kathās. t. 21), the hero's marriage with Vegavatī and Gandharvadattā (Kathās. l. 105 and 106), sometimes on the contrary we meet with persons not occurring there, as Priyadarçanā, the lady whose name is found in the colophons of sarga 20 and 22—26.

Further, M. Lacôte observes that the whole plan of composition of the „Bṛhatkathā çlokasaṅgraha” is quite different: „Il ne se compose pas d'une collection de contes variés.... Le souci de l'ordre et de la composition y est évident; le sujet y est exactement limité; sans doute les héros y écoutent des histoires, mais ce sont contes, sinon brefs, du moins étroitement liés à l'action et mieux fondus dans le récit.” (ll. p. 31).

M. Lacôte proposes to take up the question of the interrelation of the two different Bṛhatkathās together with his edition of the çlokasaṅgraha. We for our part, as we are dealing with the Bṛhat-

kathā as the source of the Kathāsaritsāgara, and since there can be no doubt as to which redaction of the Br̥hatkathā underlies the poems of Somadeva and Kṣemendra, leave this point awaiting for the rest with great interest the results of Lacôte's investigations. In the following Chapter, however, the nature of the facts and questions examined there, will oblige us to make known our preliminary opinion about that interrelation, as far as it has been fixed by the data as yet available.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE BRHATKATHĀ. ITS DATE AND ITS AUTHOR.

When was the Br̥hatkathā composed?

The question is answered differently by competent scholars. WEBER, in the 2<sup>d</sup> ed. of his *Indische Literaturgeschichte*, in 1876, said hesitatingly (p. 229, n. 224) „aus etwa dem sechsten (?) Jahrh.”; BÜHLER in his *Detailed Report of a Tour in Kashmir*, which appeared one year after, peremptorily pronounced: „Guṇāḍhya’s Vṛihatkathā goes back to the first or second century of our era”; SYLVAIN LÉVI in his *Théâtre indien*, 1891 (p. 317 at the bottom) preferred a date between both limits, but nearer to that fixed by Bühler: „L’auteur de la Br̥hatkathā païcācī, qui vivait avant la fin du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle (Subandhu le cite à cette époque) et probablement au III<sup>e”</sup> <sup>1)</sup>. And a few years ago, VINCENT A. SMITH, in an article on *Andhra History and Coinage* in the *Zeitschr. d. D. Morgenl. Ges.*, concluded „that the original Br̥hatkathā in the Paisāchī Dialect, the Saptasātaka in Mahārāṣṭrī, and the Kātantra grammar are all to be referred to the approximate date, 60 or 70 A. D.” (*ZDMG. LVI*, 660). So the work the reputed author of which is Guṇāḍhya is assigned to dates, ranging over a period of five centuries.

The *terminus ante quem* is not uncertain. It is a matter of fact that Bāṇa, who quotes the Br̥hatkathā in the preamble of his Harṣacarita, lived in the first part of the seventh century. Also that Subandhu who wrote the Vāsavadattā precedes Bāṇa in time. He, too, alludes more than once at the Br̥hatkathā. Placing his lifetime, as is usually done, in the sixth century, the necessary inference is this, that our Païcācī poem was renowned at a date nearly contemporaneous with Justinian.

As to the *terminus ex quo*, this cannot at any rate be placed before the beginning of our era. The original Br̥hatkathā must be posterior to Pāṇini and Kātyāyana-Vararuci by several centuries. The persons of both grammarians occur in the main stories of the

<sup>1)</sup> In 1905 the same scholar prefers the 2<sup>d</sup> century, see his *Le Népal*, II, 63.

first lambaka, the Kathāpīṭha, where Vararuci is no other than the gaṇa Puṣpadanta in his human existence, to which he had been condemned by a curse (vid. *supra*, p. 1). The fabulous things told about him are so wonderful that at the first acquaintance with the Kathāsaritsāgara it was universally accepted that there must be a considerable space of time between the age of the real Vararuci and the putting to writing of the legendary stories recorded in the Kathāpīṭha. Nobody, therefore, has ventured to assign to the Paiçācī poem any earlier date than the first century A. D. Bühler, whose high authority makes his statement (1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>d</sup> century) be accepted by most scholars<sup>1)</sup>, came to this conclusion upon general considerations, it seems. Vincent A. Smith, circumscribing the time of its composition within the limits of the third quarter of the first century A. D., follows this line of argument. His starting-point is the Udayagiri rock inscription of king Khāravela of Kaliṅga, dated of the 165<sup>th</sup> year of the Maurya era. We learn from it that in 168 B. C. that monarch was assisted by his ally Çātakarnī [or Sātakarnī] whose realm was in the West — *abhitāyita Sātakarnī pachimadisam*<sup>2)</sup>. By combining other epigraphical and literary data (*ZDMG.*, l. l. p. 653 foll.) it may be inferred that the Çātakarnī dynasty who reigned over the Andhra state west of Kaliṅga, was established 220 B. C. and lasted until the middle of the second century A. D. Since the oldest Purāṇas, especially the Vāyu and the Mātsya, contain lists of the Andhra kings with the number of years of their reigns, it is easy to find by computation that Hāla, the 18<sup>th</sup> of the Mātsyapur. list, must have acceded „in or about 68 A. D. according to the Mātsya and in or about 54 A. D., according to the Vāyu Pur.” (*ibid.* p. 659)<sup>3)</sup>. This Hāla, also known by his other name Sātavāhana<sup>4)</sup>, is that monarch who is „credited by tradition with the patronage of three important literary works”: the anthology of Mahārāṣṭrī stanzas, known

<sup>1)</sup> See e.g. PISCHEL, *Grammatik der Prakritsprachen*, § 29, MACDONNELL, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 376.

<sup>2)</sup> Cp. BHAGVANIĀL INDRĀJI's paper in the *Actes du 6<sup>e</sup> Congrès International des Orientalistes* (Congress of Leiden), espec. p. 146.

<sup>3)</sup> Vincent A. Smith quotes, not from the text of the Matsyapur., but from Radcliff's testimony. The list is found in ch. 273. In the edition, I have at hand, brought into light by care of Pañcānana Tarkaratna (Calcutta, 1890), neither the number of the kings, nor their names and the length of their reigns do fully agree with the list as published in *ZDMG*, l.l. As long as we do not possess critical editions of the most prominent Purāṇas, it should not be losed of sight, that the exactness of their data needs requires philological test before using them.

<sup>4)</sup> I follow the spelling of PW and of Durgaprāśād in his ed. of the Kathās. Smith spells Sātavāhana.

as Hāla's Sattasaī, the Br̥hatkathā of Guṇādhyā, who was minister of Sātavāhana, and the Kātantra whose author Čarvavarman is recorded to have been another minister of the same king. Taking his conclusion, Smith infers that the three works are contemporaneous and must be placed about 60—70 A. D.

The argument is specious indeed, but I think it is rather weak by its onesidedness. If its inventor had considered also the literary side of the problem, more than one objection would have presented itself to his mind. WEBER, in the preface on his edition of the Sattasaī, which appeared in the *Abhandl.* of the *Deutsche Morgenl. Ges.* (VII, nr. 4: Ueber das Saptaçatakān des Hāla) demonstrated from words as *horā* = ḷpa, *aṅgāraaavāra* = Tuesday, and some words of Persian origin occurring in that work, that it is impossible to place the collection which bears the name of Sātavāhana before the 3<sup>d</sup> century of our era, and expressed as his own opinion that it is rather to be ascribed to a later time, of course before Bāṇa (7<sup>th</sup> cent.) who praised the anthology in the preamble of his *Harsacarita*. He who holds a different opinion is bound to infirm the strong arguments put forward in that dissertation. Vincent A. Smith did not so, and I greatly doubt how he should be able to prove an as early date as he does of a collection of verses, in which *horā* and *aṅgāravāra* are used as they are.

Then, if the Paiçācī tongue belongs to the North-western border of India, as is the opinion of Grierson, it looks strange that the birth-place of a standardwork of enormous size in that dialect is sought for in a country at so great a distance from those regions. As easy as it is to understand that a ruler of Marāṭha land passes for the reputed author of the famous anthology of Mahārāṣṭri poetry <sup>1)</sup>, as little advisable is it to believe in an historical basis of the legendary account of Sātavāhana acting as the propagator of Guṇādhyā's poem. Though no work in Paiçācī has come to us, that language must have had a considerable literature. WASSILJEW

<sup>1)</sup> GARREZ, in his compte-rendu of a former article of Weber on the Saptaçatakā in *Journ. Asiat.* Sixième Série, t. XX, 199, says of the tradition that it is trustworthy as far as „elle attribue une collection de poésies mahārāshṭri à un roi des Mahārāṣṭras”.

As to the historical foundation of that tradition I quote with my full assent the following words of the same scholar (p. 199): „Hāla, d'après le témoignage unanime du lexicographe Hemacandra, des commentateurs, de Colebrooke et de Bhau Dāji, est un nom de Čālivāhana ou Čātavāhana; ce qui n'oblige certainement pas à admettre sans contrôle que ce personnage aussi légendaire qu'historique ait effectivement recueilli ou fait recueillir les vers en question”, and ibid. p. 207: „Sans accepter cette identification [of Hāla and Sātav.] comme un fait historique, nous avons le droit d'y voir l'expression de l'opinion des Indiens, opinion qui a ni plus ni moins de valeur que celle qui rattache à Vikramāditya les œuvres les plus célèbres de la littérature sanskrite.”

records in his work on Buddhism (p. 295 of the German translation, cp. ibid. p. 226, n. 3) from Tibetan sources that one of the chief schools of the Vaibhāśikas, the Sthaviras employed the Paiçācī. If we consider that Buddhism flourished in the regions, where Paiçācī seems to be at home, this testimony seems to be trustworthy. If the legend about Guṇāḍhya being compelled by his vow to use that tongue teaches us anything real, it is this that the Paiçācī was not considered a current language within India proper. In no other wise may it be explained that Guṇāḍhya, taking the vow of *mauna*, if Çarvavarmaṇ succeeded to make a learned man out of the ignorant king in a minimum of time, engaged himself to never more use any of the three languages: Sanskrit, Prākṛit, Apabhrañga, excluding the fourth, the Paiçācī. Apparently, in the mind of the composer of the tale that language is considered a foreign tongue. This remark makes it more than doubtful that a Mahārāṣṭra king should have anything to do with the composition of the Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā. It is not an old historical tradition but the popularity of his name, that fathered on him its first lambaka.

Further, assuming for a moment that Vincent A. Smith is right taking the Kathāpīṭha for a document of some historical value, be it even so little, and also right in his fixation of the reign of the Andhra king Hāla = Sātavāhana in the time of the emperor Nero, I wonder how he did not realize the enormous anachronisms effected by combining this double evidence. The Sātavāhana of the Br̥hatkathā, king of the country Pratiṣṭhāna, the capital of which is Supratīṣṭhita<sup>1)</sup>, being coeval with the last Nandas and Candragupta, belongs accordingly to the end of the IV<sup>th</sup> century B.C. That he must be a contemporary of them is a necessary inference from what is narrated in the Kathāpīṭha. Puṣpadanta-Vararuci and Mālyavant-Guṇāḍhya were cursed *together*, they commenced their human existence *at the same time*. Now, Vararuci was the minister of the last Nanda, Guṇāḍhya of Sātavāhana. Ergo: the legendary last Nanda and his destroyer Candragupta are placed in the same time as the legendary king Sātavāhana, born out of a lioness and made by adoption son to king Dīpakarṇi. But the historical persons of that name are separated in Vincent A. Smith's own chronology by at least three centuries and a half. Considering, then, the so called data of the Kathāsaritsāgara somewhat more closely, we sink again „in the quicksands of Sanskrit literary history,” to use the image

<sup>1)</sup> See Kathās. 6, 8 *Pratiṣṭhāne 'sti nagaram Supratīṣṭhita-saṃjñakam.*

of Vincent A. Smith himself (*ZMDG*. I. I. p. 660) and have no resting-place. I pass over the difficulty that the names of the predecessor of the legendary and the historical Sātavāhana disagree (*Dīpakarṇi* and *Rikta-varṇa*<sup>1</sup>) [*Matsyapur.* adhy. 273, cl. 9]), as this point is of minor importance.

Therefore, we are constrained to place the book which records the miraculous things related about Sātavāhana and pretends to be composed by Sātavāhana himself (*Kathās.* 8, 37) in a very long time after the historical Sātavāhana. Placing this king as Vincent A. Smith does, in the third quarter of the 1<sup>st</sup> century A. D., it will be impossible to claim for the *Kathāpīṭha*, and consequently, for the Brhatkathā a date earlier than the third century of our era, the date fixed by Sylvain Lévi.

This much we have got from the *Kathāpīṭha*. But other useful intelligence is to be found in other parts of the great poem hitherto unobserved or forgotten, I believe, with the help of which the approximate date may be settled somewhat more exactly. Bühler's estimation must certainly be given up.

First of all I remind of the important fact that in the lambaka Ratnaprabhā (VII of *Som.*, XIV of *Kṣem.*) there is a miraculous story about the great Nāgārjuna (*Kathās.* 41, 9—58, *Bṛhkm.* p. 500, cl. 392—407). That it is the famous Buddhist theologian of that name and no other who is the hero of the tale is palpable as well by his being styled *Bodhisattvāṁçasambhava* (*Kathās.* 41, 10) as by the nature of his exploits. The historical Nāgārjuna belongs doubtless to a later period than the Sātavāhana of Vincent A. Smith. KERN, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, p. 118, places him ± 150 A. D.; Tāranātha treats of his deeds and his immense knowledge after completing his relation of Kaniṣka and the Third Council, at which time Buddhist tradition places the birth of Nāgārjuna. Arguing as before and leaving ever so much room for the promptness of devotees to endow the divine master and Bodhisattva, as they will have considered him already during his lifetime, with miraculous and superhuman powers, yet the extremely wonderful story told about him presupposes a distance of time of at least one century. Accordingly, our *terminus ex quo* for the date of the Brhatkathā advances to the latter half of the third century A.D. at the utmost, and it begins to be likely that its composition cannot be dated before 300 A.D.

<sup>1</sup>) I find the name in the printed text, mentioned *supra*. Radcliff, who is the source of Smith, names this king: Gorakṣa-vāčī or Gaurakṛṣṇa, Naurikṛṣṇa, Vikṛṣṇa. We have here a fair sample of how much MSS may disagree in Paurānik texts!

The big lambaka Çācāñkavatī which contains little short of 5000 çlokas in Kathās. and almost half of that number in Br̥hkm. is for its greater part made up of the romantic adventures of Mṛgāñkadatta, the prototype, as is commonly believed, of the plot of Dandin's Daçakumāracarita. Mṛgāñkadatta is the son of the Ayodhyā king Amaradatta. Him his father banished from his realm at the instigation of his first minister who falsely accused the prince of sorcery, alleging him to be by his incantations the cause of an attack of cholera which had befallen the king. What moved that first minister to act so? He bore a grudge to Mṛgāñkadatta. Some time before, the prince „while walking about on the top of his palace, spit down some beteljuice. And as ill luck would have it, it fell on the head of his father's minister, who happened to be walking below, unseen by the prince”<sup>1)</sup>. This essential feature of the story is told in precisely the same way in both Sanskrit redactions, it belongs doubtless to the original Br̥hatkathā.

Now, prof. KERN more than twenty years ago made the observation that the habit of betel-chewing must have been introduced in the land of the Hindoos in a time, which roughly taken may be determined between Caraka and Suçruta. „It appears from Jātaka (ed. Fausb.) II, 320, that at the time of the redaction of the prose commentary the habit of chewing betel existed already. No such use of betel ever occurs in the older parts of the Buddhistic canonical books, as the Mahā- and Cullavagga; nor is it found neither in the Mahābhārata, Rāmāyaṇa, Caraka, where it could not have been passed over tacitly, if existing. The use of tāmbūla is mentioned only with authors of the sixth century of our era, unless Suçruta is to be placed some time before<sup>2)</sup>”. Here I firstly remind that Caraka is reputed to have been the physician of king Kaniṣka. Further that *tambūla* as a Pāli word is quoted by Childers from the Mahāvaṁśo. Moreover, a similar difference as to the use of betel as stated

<sup>1)</sup> I quote from TAWNEY's translation of the Kathas. II, 147. The original, t. 70, 5. 6 is as follows:

tatkālam cātra so 'kasmāt sañcaran harmyapras̄hataḥ  
Mṛgāñkadattas tāmbulāniṣṭhīvanarasāṇi jahau ||  
sa ca tasvāpatan mārdhni dairāt tatpīlāmantriṇiḥ.

Kṣemendra relates the same fact, p. 229, ql. 172, thus:

tataḥ kadācit tāmbulayandusāṇi harmyaçekharāt  
Mṛgāñkadattas tasyājā . sa papāta sumantriṇi ||

According to his habit, he is eager to communicate to his readers the name of that minister, Vinayavant (ql. 173); Somadeva omits it. Cp. *supra*, p. 40 note 2.

<sup>2)</sup> I have translated this quotation from the original Dutch, see KERN, *Bijdrage tot de verklaring van eenige woorden in Pali-geschriften voorkomende*, p. 6. Cp. also WEBER, *Indische Streifen* II, 59.

above, is recognizable, too, in the Avadānaçataka if compared with the Avadānamālās, which contain paraphrases of edifying tales belonging to the Avadānaçataka<sup>1)</sup> The use of the betel after dinner is regular in those younger texts, but it is never mentioned in the older work which has been paraphrased by them. The strength of the argumentum ex silentio is unimpeachable here, for the *same* relations of dinners offered to Buddha the Lord are without betel in the Avadānaçataka and with betel in the Avadānamālās.

Applying, then, the criterion of the *tāmbūla* to our inquiry after the date of composition of the Br̥hatkathā, the story of Mr̥gāñkадatta can scarcely have been invented, or at least have been put on the form in which it is related in the Great Tale, before the fourth century A.D. at the lowest rate. And taking into account that this whole episode of Mr̥gāñkадatta is not an invention of the composer of the Br̥hatkathā, but that he included it within his compilation; that, therefore, it must have existed already as an independent composition in his days — we will not be far from truth, I believe, concluding from this that the Br̥hatkathā itself can be placed by no manner before the fifth century.

The strength of this reasoning is supported by another consideration. Bāṇa in the preface of his Harṣacarita, praisingly names the great authors in whose steps he ventures to tread. He extols as models of excellent poetry in eight clokas as many renowned works: among them the Vāsavadattā (of Subandhu), Sātavāhana's (= Hāla's) anthology, the Setubandha, the works of Kālidāsa, the nāṭakas of Bhāsa, and also our Br̥hatkathā. The works he admires are both Sanskrit and Prākrit compositions, and the tone and spirit of this whole passage reminds of the *prastāvanā* of the Mālavikāgnimitra, in which young Kālidāsa appeals to the sound judgment of his audience for his literary debut. For this purpose it is not to be expected that he will have taken the standard authors and classical works he praises from far remote antiquity. There can scarcely be allowed a larger track of time between the oldest of them and his own days than two centuries. He does not name Vālmīki, and Vyāsa he addresses in quite another connection, in the solemn invocation of deities and r̥sis, which according to custom opens his book. His naming, then, of the Great Tale, the hero of which is Naravāhanadatta, the God of Love born again, not only proves the

---

<sup>1)</sup> See my paper „Eenige bundels van avadānas, stichtelijke verhalen der Noordelijke Buddhisten” (Versl. en Meded. der Kon. Akad. v. Wet. Afd. Lett., IVde Reeks, dl. III) p. 399.

existence of the Br̥hatkathā about 600 A. D., something beyond discussion, but also makes it probable that the date of its composition cannot be too much remote from that limit.

The date settled, however roughly, in this manner will prove useful in its consequences. We obtain by it also some evidence for the time of composition of the Mudrārākṣasa.

In Kathās. t. 60, the contents of which are identical with those of Pañcatantra Book I, the following çloka occurs (119 ed. Br. = 118 ed. Durg.):

*dvayor dattapadā sū ca taylor uccritayoç calā<sup>1)</sup>  
na çaknoti ciram sthātum dhruvam ekam vimuñcati*

= „The fickle (*calā*) goddess [*sū* refers to Çrī named in the preceding çloka], if she places her feet at the same time upon two exalted persons, cannot keep her footing long, she will certainly abandon one of the two” (Tawney’s transl. II, 34). This sentence is a free imitation of a triṣṭubh of Viçākhadatta, the author of the Mudrārākṣasa. It is found in the Fourth Act of that drama (p. 146 of Majumdār’s Series ed. = p. 179 ed. Trimbak Telang):

*atyucchrite mantriṇi pārthive ca  
riṣṭabhyā pādāv upatiṣṭhate Çrīḥ,  
sū strīsvabhāvānd asahā bharasya  
taylor dvayor ekataram jahāti*

= „If Çrī [= Fortuna Regia] has to attend a king with a very exalted minister, she must take hold on them with her stretched feet placed from another, but owing to her womanhood being too weak to keep them, she will (soon) abandon one of the two.”

Now this selfsame triṣṭubh is met with in the Tantrākhyāyika (I, 56), that is the oldest redaction of the Pañcatantra come down to us, and it occurs there at the same point of the tale, yea, at the same point of the conversation of Damanaka and Piṅgalaka, where Somadeva puts his free imitation of the stanza. Dr. Hertel, in his edition of the Tantrākhyāyika<sup>2)</sup>, has shown that there exists a close connection between that text and the

<sup>1)</sup> Brockhaus reads, it is not clear for what reason, *Calu*.

<sup>2)</sup> Band XXII, nr. V of the *Abhandlungen der phil.-hist. Klasse der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*. Leipzig, Teubner 1904.

The Br̥hkm. has here nothing corresponding to Kathas. 60, 119 (118). This is sufficiently accounted for by the extreme brevity of Kṣemendra in this portion of his work, cp. *supra*, p. 17 below.

Pañcatantra portion of the Br̥hatkathā<sup>1)</sup>. It follows from this that the double fact of the identity of the Mudrārākṣasa triṣṭubh with Tantrākhy. I, 56 and of the occurrence of the anuṣṭubh imitative of it in Somadeva's poem at the very place where its prototype is met with in Tantrākhy. cannot be the effect of chance. This alternative may be stated a priori: either Viçākhadatta borrowed the stanza from Pañc. respectively from the same authority as Pañc. did, or that oldest recension of Pañc. is younger than the Mudrārākṣasa. As to the former member of the alternative, it is expressly stated in Tantrākhy. that the stanza is a quotation (*sādhu caitad ucyate*). So it becomes very improbable that Viçākhadatta took it from Pañc. Nor is it likely that he took it from any other text. Every one who reads over the scene of Mudr., in which the stanza is found, will feel convinced that both the contents and the wording of it are in perfect agreement with the peculiar situation of the context and must have their *original home* there. Hence it follows that Viçākhadatta and his admirable drama are to be placed many centuries earlier than is generally done; for a stanza from it was quoted in even that redaction of Pañc., which was taken up in the Br̥hatkathā. Since the Br̥hatkathā must have been composed ± 400 A.D., the date of the Mudrārākṣasa is needs to be put at least one generation before that time.

WILSON, as is known, was induced by the *bharatavākyā* commemorating Mlechhas as a cause of fear to India, to postpone its composition to the times of the great Mohammedan invasions; still WEBER (*Ind. Literaturg.*<sup>2</sup> 224 n. 218) believed it to be „aus etwa dem zwölften Jahrhundert”. Subsequent scholars were well aware that neither the spirit of the drama nor the relations and conditions of society and religion as represented in it were suitable to a so late time, but the complete absence of any datum fit for serving as a point of starting to research, and the prejudice of Wilson's estimation which dominated in their minds prevented them from modifying his statement otherwise than by abating it a little and a little. JACOBI, in the second volume of the *Wiener Zeitschrift* very cleverly calculated even the date of the first representation of the Mudrārākṣasa Dec. 2 of 860 A.D. — but his premises were false; MACDONNELL put the *terminus ante quem* on about 800 (*Hist. of Sanskr. Lit.* p. 365); Kâshinâth Trimbak Telang in his

<sup>1)</sup> In that recension of the Pañc. which is known as the Southern one and which takes its origin from the Tantrākhy., the stanza is likewise found with some modifications. See *Das Siälliche Pañcatantra*, herausg. von J. HERTEL — quoted *supra*, p. 41, note 1 — p. 13.

edition of the play pleaded for the conclusion that „it belongs to somewhere about the early part of the eighth century A.D.” (p. XXVI). But I think I have proved that it is by four or five centuries older, and must rank with the *Mṛcchakaṭī* as the two most ancient plays of the Hindu theatre come to us. Both dramas are ascribed to authors about whom almost nothing is known but their name. Çūdraka bears even a somewhat mythical character, Viçākhadatta, whose father and paternal grandfather are named in the prologue of his play, may have been a historical person, but no tradition whatever concerning him does exist. This is wholly consistent with his belonging to a very ancient time.

I am inclined to suppose that the *Candragupta* named in the *bharatavākyā* of Mudrār. may be an allusion to some prince of that name who belonged to the dynasty of the Guptas. He who is eulogized in that final stanza as a successful protector against the threatening Mlechas may be *Candragupta I*, the founder of the new and national dynasty, who lived in the beginning, or his glorious descendant *Candragupta II* at the end of the fourth century. It would be no matter of wondering at, if the brilliant exploits, especially of the first *Candragupta* who subverted a secular domination of „barbarians” in the N. and N. W. parts of India, had prompted the unknown poet Viçākhadatta to glorify a similar establishment of a mighty national monarchy by the namesake of his king and by his famous minister. This hypothesis, which is in congruity with the line of argument I have followed when proceeding from the *triṣṭubh* stanza common to Mudrār. and *Tantrākhyāyika*, is not contradicted by the style and language of the play. The style is characterized by its relative simplicity, the diction is exquisite and some lexicological facts may indicate an ancient date of its composition. E. g. the use of *ārāya* = ‘body’ in the forged letter (Act V): *svārāyavināṣena*, is only met with in Buddhist Sanskrit texts of the first centuries A.D. and is, therefore, not registered in the Petrop. Dictionary; of *pārvaya* (Act III, st. 10) = ‘religious festival’; perhaps of *opalapana* — not mentioned in the Petr. Dict. — Act III, st. 14, see Kâshinâth’s ed. p. 121 with commentary.<sup>1)</sup>

By the bye I remark that it is highly improbable that Viçā-

---

<sup>1)</sup> I am somewhat uncertain about *kalatra* (Act I, st. 15). If the edited text is right, this word, which is always a synonym of *dārāḥ*, *jāyā*, *bhāryā* and may also signify the „zenana”, has here the meaning of ‘family’ in the largest sense; in this case it is very probable that this word may be reckoned an archaism. But I greatly doubt the genu-

khadatta, as Sylvain Lévi affirms (*Le théâtre indien*, p. 226), borrowed the subject-matter of his *nāṭaka* from the Br̥hatkathā „cette source inépuisable.” In the poems of Somadeva and Kṣemendra the sole fact of Candragupta’s overturn of the Nandas is narrated and in a very concise way, but the events that happened after Cānakya’s vengeance and his triumph and conquest of the royalty are not mentioned, nor does the name of Rākṣasa anywhere occur. If anything is certain, it is this that Viṣākhadattā did *not* borrow the plot of his drama from the Br̥hatkathā.

After this digression going back to the main subject of this disquisition, we will bring forth now some indications of various kind leading in the same direction to fix the date of the Br̥hatkathā about ± 400 A.D. They may also afford some basis for further investigation. For this reason they are put forward. Their demonstrating power, if considered separately, is perhaps not so great but combined, they may help to strengthen the reasoning exposed in the foregoing.

1. The historical tradition of the foundation of Pāṭaliputra must have been fully overgrown with legendary accounts and even wholly forgotten at the time when the Br̥hatkathā was composed. Passing over the well-known miraculous story of the origin of the famous capital of the Mauryas, as it is narrated in Kathās. t. 3 and Br̥hkm. p. 10—12, I remark that the author of our collection of tales makes Vasantaka and Tapantaka tell stories of events happened in former days (*prāk*) at Pāṭaliputra (see Kathās. 17, 64 cp. Br̥hkm. p. 79, cl. 136 and Kathās. 57, 25 cp. Br̥hkm. p. 541, cl. 12). In the mind of him who wrote down this, the new capital of Magadha, of a relatively recent date, is spoken of as existing already long before Udayana, who is reputed coeval with the Buddha; just as Kālidāsa (*Raghuv.* 6, 24) supposes Pāṭaliputra as existing in the days of Raghu and Aja!

2. The name of the country Nepal is found in the Br̥hatkathā. It occurs in the fifteenth tale of the Vetaṭa: Kathās. 89, 3 and Br̥hkm. 345, cl. 718. As far as I know, the name of Nepal is mentioned the first time in the documents available in the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. It is not met with in Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa. Cp. S. Lévi, *Le Népal II*, 61—63.

---

neness of the transmitted wording, because *sampatsu cāpatsu ca* can hardly be accounted for; the locatives are supervacuous and would better be wanting.

I would rather think the 4<sup>th</sup> pāda of the stanza must be read thus: *te bhṛtyā nṛpateḥ kalaṭram itarāt sampatsu cāpatsu ca* „these servants are (like) another wife in both prosperity and adversity”.

3. The Br̥hatkathā knows still dīnāras as pieces of money. In the tale of Vīravāra the daily salary of that loyal warrior is five hundred dīnāras. In the Kathās. this is related both times, for the story is told twice over in t. 53 and t. 78 (cp. 53, 92 with 78 [= Vetāla 4], 11). Kṣemendra, in his set of Vetālastories, instead of *dīnāraçatapañcakam* expresses the amount of his wages in rupees: *sadā pañca pradiyantām rūpakāññām çatāni me* (p. 310, ql. 279); his parallel of the Vīravara tale as narrated in Kathās. t. 53 being exceedingly short (vide p. 525), the salary is not even mentioned there. It is plain that Somadeva's dīnāras, not Kṣemendra's rūpakas, represent the coinage as given in the original Br̥hatkathā. In the eleventh century there was nothing that might induce an author to replace *rūpaka* by *dīnāra*, the name of an obsolete coin, but there must have been a strong bias to put *rūpaka*, the name of a coin in ordinary use, instead of the antiquated *dīnāra*<sup>1)</sup>. The coin named *dīnāra* is mentioned in inscriptions of the 5<sup>th</sup> century and even later, see *Journ. of the Roy. As. Soc.* 1906, p. 891.

4. In Kathās. 37, 36 foll. the name of the Tājiks occurs. It is not absolutely certain that Somadeva found that name in his original, for Kṣemendra in the parallel place (Br̥hkm. p. 482) is silent about them. With him, it is Turuṣkas and Cīnas who overpowered and captured Niçcayadatta and his comrades, not Tājiks, as with Somadeva. The latter does not name at all the Cīnas, he names one Turuṣka, viz. the king Muravāra, to whose presence the captives are brought. I hold it for probable that Somadeva is here as usual nearer to the original. Now, it should be kept in mind that the Turks, who are doubtless meant with the name of Turuṣkas, appear for the first time in history in the sixth century. NÖLDEKE, in his *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden, aus der arabischen Chronik des Tabārī* p. 53 note, remarks that „it was not before the time of the Sasanide Chosrau I that the Turks became dangerous neighbours of the Persians“. It is, however, possible, not to say likely, that they occupied already in the fourth and fifth centuries regions conterminous with the eastern and northern frontier of the Persian monarchy. In that case there would be nothing strange in the fact that an Indian work of the 5<sup>th</sup> century should relate of an Indian merchant, taking his way from Puṣkarāvatī to the North, who having reached a country inhabited by

<sup>1)</sup> A similar case of *dīnāra* found in the older recension but ousted and replaced by another word in the younger one is met with in the story of Somilaka in Pañcatantra. Instead of the *dīnāraḥ* he earns in the Tantrākhyāyika (ed. Hertel, p. 61), he makes *suvarṇaçatatravayam* in the younger redaction edited by Bühler (II, 29, 14).

Tājiks, was made a slave by them and sold to some Turuṣka or some king of Turuṣkas. Again mention is made of the Turuṣkas in the relation of the *dīgvijaya* of Udayana by Somadeva (t. 19); he defeats the cavalry of the Turuṣkas (cl. 109), kills the king of the Pārasikas (cl. 110) and puts to flight the Hūṇas (cl. 111) — the corresponding passage of Kṣemendra (p. 93 f.) is so much shortened that it does not contain anything to be compared. And if we take into account also that in the first book of the Rājataraṇginī the kings Kaniṣka, Huviṣka and Vasuṣka (Vasudeva) are named Turuṣkas, and that this testimony, be it ever so weak, must rest upon some old tradition, there seems to be nothing inconsistent in the fact that in a literary work composed on the eve of the 5<sup>th</sup> century A.D. the Turks are mentioned as a people established north from Jambudvīpa.

To summarize the inference to be drawn from theforesaid data and indirect indications, there can be no more question of the first or second century as the time of composition of the Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā, as was proposed by Bühler and Vincent A. Smith, and even Lévi's option in 1891 for the 3<sup>d</sup> century would make the work somewhat older than it really is. I think Albrecht Weber's opinion uttered rather hesitatingly was nearer to the truth. Yet the work will be older than the 6<sup>th</sup> century A.D. Its composition may be put about one century before, but I dare not go back beyond the year 400.

A strong objection against this conclusion would arise, if dr. Hertel were right asserting that the Br̥hatkathā, which was sanskritized by the two Kashmirian poets was not the old and famous work of that name, but a younger compilation, enlarged with interpolations of a great extent<sup>1)</sup>. In his opinion, such groups of coherent tales, which by themselves represent separate books, as the Pañcatantra tales and the Vetalapañcavimṣati, did not belong to the original work. If this might prove to be true, then the prototype of the poems of Somadeva and Kṣemendra would cease to be a creditable source of information and a starting-point for research with respect to the „genuine” Paiçācī Br̥hatkathā known to Subandhu and Bāṇa. In each given case the exception of the passage in question belonging to the interpolated portions could be made; by what test should we discern the different elements of the younger compilation?

But the danger is as yet not so imminent. Hertel means we

<sup>1)</sup> In the passage of his preface quoted *supra* p. 41 below.

have to look for the old Guṇāḍhya's own composition in the third (Sanskrit) redaction discovered by Hara Prasād, of which we have spoken *supra*, p. 41. When he expressed this view, he had not read even a single letter of the text he claims to stand nearest to the original Br̥hatkathā; for at the time he published it, he was not aware, nor could he, of M. Lacôte's article in the *Journal Asiatique*. He had no other materials at his disposal than the colophons communicated by Hara Prasād. M. Lacôte, who *has* the manuscripts at hand and *is* preparing an edition, is more cautious and circumspect in his judgment. He presumes, indeed, that „autant qu'on peut fonder un jugement d'ensemble sur un court fragment”, it has the appearance of native colour and genuineness which might induce the reader to think it nearer to the original Guṇāḍhya than the poem of Somadeva. Yet M. Lacôte is discreet. „Est-il un portrait plus fidèle de la Br̥hatkathā de Guṇāḍhya que le Kathāsaritsāgara et la Br̥hatkathāmañjari? Je m'expliquerai ultérieurement sur cette question. Mais il est dès maintenant certain qu'il devient une pièce essentielle dans le procès.”

While waiting for the dissertation on this question by M. Lacôte on the ground of the new document at his disposal, I think I am justified to uphold the results of my examination of it by the light of the old documents. I draw the attention to the following points.

1. Since the genuine Br̥hatkathā was composed in Paiçācī, the new redaction, the *Br̥hatkathāyām* (or <sup>°</sup>*thāyāh?*) *çlokasaṅgrahaḥ* cannot be but a modified representation of it. Is it a faithful translation or an imitation? The title itself speaks against its being a faithful translation. A *çlokasaṅgraha* does certainly not mean the original work, but may denote its complete contents in a compendious form. What it exactly means, will perhaps appear when the whole work as far as extant will be published.

2. As we have notified above (*supra*, p. 42), the first sarga of the Çlokasaṅgraha presupposes an account of the precedent events different from the other Br̥hatkathā. When Udayana abdicated to become an ascetic (Kathās. 111, 59 foll.), in both Kathās. and Br̥hkm. it is not Gopālaka but his brother Pālaka who is installed king at Kauçāmbī; though the kingdom had been offered to him by Udayana, he declined it and left the sovereign power for the ascetic life in the forest. So Pālaka has two kingdoms under his sceptre; for after the death of his father Cañdamahāsena he had succeeded to him at Ujjayinī (Kathās. 111, 64; 112, 13). But in the Çlokasaṅgraha Gopālaka reigns at Ujjayinī, and when being king he grows disgusted with the possession of royal power, so that he

abdicates and gives over his kingdom to his brother Pālaka. It is difficult to ascribe these contrarious courses of events to one and the same Brhatkathā. If they belong to different redactions, which of the two was the genuine one? It is impossible to decide this a priori, I think.

3. I doubt whether the fragment begins with the first sarga of the whole work. It is more probable, I suppose, that it is the beginning of a new section. It is not in the habit of the authors of Indian literary compositions, and certainly not of large poems, to take up their audience or readers directly *in medias res*, without any preamble, as is the fact with the first sarga, published by M. Lacôte. The whole purport of its narrative makes the strong impression that it belongs to a new section of the work, but is not the commencement of the whole. The *kathāmukham* in the colophon of the third sarga may denote the outset of the narration of the life and adventures of Naravāhanadatta told by himself, perhaps to Gopālaka, at a time when he was already consecrated *cakravartin* of the Vidyādhara.

4. M. Lacôte reckons the relation of the life of Guṇāḍhya and the lambakas II and III of our Brhatkathā in 18 lambakas among the „hors-d'oeuvre” (Journ. As. l. l. p. 32). Would he think so, if he were not prejudiced by the thought that the MSS of Clokasamgraha at his disposal contain a fragment of a work which did not comprise the story of Guṇāḍhya and the Udayanacarita? The Udayanacarita, from the point of view of Indian composition, must be considered as essential a part of a Naravāhanadattacarita, as for instance the story of Pāṇḍu in a narration of the Pāṇḍavas, or the burning of Kāma in the Kumārasambhava. What prevents its belonging to the much greater portion of the Clokasamgraha which is not extant? The same applies to the Kathāpīṭha. The original Brhatkathā, methinks, must have related in its opening the miraculous process, which accounts for the promulgation among mankind of the divine tale, the author of which is God Civa himself. This account is indispensable and conformable to Indian methods of introducing such large collections as the Brhatkathā.

5. Even if we take it for granted that the Clokasamgraha represents a recension more united and less stuffed with inserted tales derived from heterogeneous sources than the Brhatkathā in eighteen lambakas, this fact in itself does not necessarily imply its being the older recension. It is something very common in Indian literature to find side by side longer and shorter expositions of the like contents. Many legends and stories in the Mahābhārata occur

more than once, sometimes told *samāseṇa*, sometimes *vistareṇa*. Of the *Prajñāparamitā*, the most holy book of the Mahāyānists there exist longer and shorter redactions, all of them canonical: one in 100.000, one in 25.000, one in 18.000, one in 10.000, one in 8000 lines. Is the greatest one also the youngest in time, or are the smaller ones abridgments and extracts of the large *Catasahasraprajñāpāramitā*? BURNOUF, *Introduction*, p. 464 pronounces a *non liquet*. The Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana pretends to be an extract of Bābhṛavya's composition, which is an epitome of a larger work composed by Ćvetaketu, which itself again was the abridgment of the original Kāmasūtra in 1000 adhyāyas revealed by Čiva's bull Nandin! For this reason, even if the existence of two Paiçācī Br̥hatkathās were to be proved satisfactorily, one larger and one smaller, this fact would not prejudicate the answer to be given at the question about the time-relation between them.

6. The story of the Br̥hatkathā, to which Subandhu (p. 110 of Hall's ed.) alludes, is a tale inserted into the story of Viṣamaçīla which makes up lambaka XVIII of Kathās. This king and his adventures have nothing at all to do with Naravāhanadatta, safe that N. listens to the narration by Kaṇva. This story, if any, would be one of the „hors-d'œuvre” interpolated into the genuine Br̥hatkathā, if interpolation had happened! It was nevertheless known to Subandhu, in the sixth century A.D., and known as occurring in Guṇādhyā's Br̥hatkathā.

7. The same passage of Subandhu teaches us also something more. The Br̥hatkathā, to which he refers, was divided into *lambhakās* or *lambhās*. The same division must needs have been that of the Paiçācī prototype worked upon by the two Kashmirian poets. In the MSS of Br̥hkm. the books are called *lambaka* or *lambhaka* (see the article of Bühler in the *Ind. Antiqu.* of 1871 and the colophon of book I, p. 33 of the edit.). In Kathās. both editors every-where agree in naming them *lambaka*. Cp. *supra*, p. 11, n. 1. But the new fragment is not divided into lamba(ka)s, but into sargas.

As to the person of Guṇādhyā, the reputed author of the Br̥hatkathā, the opinions vary. According to some he is a historical person, according to others, his name is likely to be as fictitious as that of the Vedavyāsa. It is impossible to settle the question. The Br̥hatkathā has this in common with so many old works ascribed to individual authors that the name of the reputed author occurs in the work itself. How can Sātavāhana be the real author of Kathāpīṭha, where his own wondrous history is narrated and he

is spoken of in the third person? Let us rather avow that we do not know anything about the reputed authors of the Great Storehouse of Tales and that is something like to nothing to combine their authorship with the names — mere names, indeed — of Guṇāḍhya and Sātavāhana, the intrinsic value of which is = x. The only conclusion permitted to us, and this at least is more than nothing, is this, that a celebrated work, the author or authors of which are half mythical persons, must be ancient. For the rest, in questions like these account must be kept with analogous imputation of the authorship of celebrated and authoritative works on mythical personages. I refer to the statement of JOLLY in the *Journal of the Roy. Asiat. Society* 1907, p. 174, about medical tradition, where he says: „Since it was a generally prevailing practice with writers of medical textbooks to give out their compositions as an abridgment of some early work written by a divinely inspired sage.”

## S E C T I O N II.

### THE TEXT OF THE KATHĀSARITSĀGARA.

---

#### CHAPTER I.

##### THE TWO EDITIONS.

###### § 1.

As has been stated above (*supra*, p. 7), the Kathāsaritsāgara has been edited twice, by Brockhaus and by Durgaprasād (and his son Kāshināth Pāndurang Parab). The former's edition is based on six MSS for his first volume and on an equal number for his second and third volumes. Yet these are not quite the same. Four of those which served him for his publication of lamb. I—V were left aside, when he was preparing the edition of the rest, as necessarily results from a comparison of the two prefaces of 1839 and 1864. It is plain that he could no longer avail himself of M = nr. 3959 of the *Catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts in the library of the India Office*, for it stops after lamb. V, but it is not clear what prevented him from making use, as he did before, of A = nr. 3948—50, B = either nr. 3951—53 or 3956—58, C = nr. 3954 and 55. Of the other two, one was employed accordingly for the whole work: D, a copy taken from a Calcutta MS, the original of which belongs to the Sanskrit college; this copy is now in the Royal Library at Berlin<sup>1)</sup>; as to the other, W, a copy from a Benares MS, forwarded to him by Wilson, Brockhaus says: „aus ihr habe ich cap. 27—61 copirt”; it is now at Oxford in the Bodleyana. The four new manuscripts acquired for the constitution of the text of lamb. VI—XVIII, II, G, S, and R are now at Berlin in the Royal Library (see Weber's *Verzeichniss der Sanskrit und Prākrit-Handschriften* [der Königl. Bibl. zu Berlin] II, nr. 1574—1578). Of them S (nr. 1577) is a copy from a

<sup>1)</sup> Brockhaus presented it to the Royal Library of Dresden; but afterwards it passed over to Berlin, see Weber's *Verzeichniss* II, nr. 1569—1573 with the foot-note 5 on p. 158.

Sagor MS which he had obtained from Fitz Edward Hall; its original, a Kashmir MS, the oldest *pustaka* of his whole apparatus „gehörte wohl in den Anfang des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts” (Weber).

The two pandits who brought about the Bombay edition, printed at the Nirṇayasāgara Press, had besides the edition of Brockhaus two more MSS at their disposition. The former of which they describe thus (p. 2 of their Preface): *tatra Kaçmīralikhitam ekañ navinam prāyah çuddham asmadiyam puṣtakam*. The other MS did not belong to them, but to the Townhall Royal Library at Bombay, being formerly Dr. Bhau Dâjî's; it has been written samvat 1743 = 1686 A.D. at Benares and is not so good as the former one — *nātiçud-dham* — though very neatly kept, *manoharasvarūpam*. I suppose that it is from the Kashmir MS the editors took a good deal of the excellent corrections by which their publication surpasses the edition of Brockhaus.

Neither edition has the right to be called a critical one. The text is critically edited, but there is no reference whatever made to the various readings of the MSS. Brockhaus, in the Preface on his first volume (p. IX), declares that he did his utmost to make the best of the discrepancies of his MSS. „Nicht überall ist mir dies gelungen, viele Stellen sind mir undeutlich oder ganz unerklärlich geblieben, doch habe ich es als strengen Grundsatz durchgeführt, keine Conjecturen in den Text aufzunehmen, sondern nur durch Handschriften autorisierte Lesarten.” In 1839, though he realized, it seems, that a scholarlike edition could not do without a mention, however succinct, of the most important various readings, especially in such places as remained „undeutlich oder ganz unerklärlich”, yet the addition of them, he says, would have augmented the cost so exceedingly that he was obliged to omit „diese Zugaben, für so wichtig und nothwendig ich sie auch halte”. A similar complaint is made in the Preface on p. IV of the last volume (1866): „Die Varianten aus den Handschriften mitzutheilen, war unmöglich; ich hätte dazu den doppelten Raum, den der Text einnimmt, gebraucht.”

It is a matter of course that the Nirṇayasāgara Press edition is likewise devoid of even the shortest *apparatus criticus*. Something like this is not in the habit of Hindoo scholars.

If once, in time hereafter, the critical edition suitable for a work of that importance will be called for, many more MSS must be consulted. Aufrecht, in his Catalogus Catalogorum, registers them at p. 78 of his 1<sup>st</sup> vol., to which he adds others in his Part II and III. I cannot find that Brockhaus availed himself of MS 1579 in Weber's Catalogue.

Tawney, in the notes on his translation, sometimes makes mention of better readings than the text of Brockhaus offered him, which he borrowed from MSS of the Calcutta College. The first time he cites one, is Vol. I., p. 148, with respect to tar. 19, 64, where Br.<sup>1)</sup> reads *dattasampadah* and D<sup>1)</sup> has put into the text *sammadah*; his MS has *sambhavah*. At p. 155 Tawney doubtless refers to the same MS „lent to me by the librarian of the Sanskrit College,” cp. his note on p. 203, where he calls it „an excellent MS.” Afterwards he had the opportunity of using also three India Office MSS lent to him by Dr. Rost, which I suppose to be those denoted by Brockhaus as A, B and C; readings from them are mentioned in the foot-notes from tar. 102 till the end of the work, see note on II, 388 etc.

Upon the whole the MSS contain nearly the same text. There are instances of çlokas found in one MS and wanting in another, but they are few, very few. Tar. 23, 4—7 in Br.’s ed. have one line less and one more, than they have in D. D’s 23, 4 a b is wanting in Br., and Br.’s 23, 7 c d is wanting in D. — Between Br. 24, 146 and 147 D interposes one çloka; this çloka (D 24, 147) added improves the narrative style. — Likewise at t. 26, 134, D has two çlokas more and in a place, where they are indispensable. This is even transparent in T’s<sup>1)</sup> translation (I, 226): „Thereupon the Brâhman set out with the merchant’s agents to go to that island of Utsthala, and by chance the sons of the king of fishermen saw him there.” It is told here that Çaktideva set out to Utsthala, but it is not told that he arrived; but his departure is closely connected with his meeting in that island with the sons of Satyavrata. In D the passage runs thus — I have bracketed that which is wanting in Br.:

ity uktas tena vanijā sa tais tadvayavahāribhiḥ  
sākām tad Utsthaladvipam (Çaktidevo yayau tataḥ ||  
yah sa bandhur mahātmā me Viṣṇudatto ’tra tisṭhati  
prāgvat tasyaiva nikālam vastum icchāmi tanmatham ||  
iti samprāpya ca dvipam tatkālam ca vicintya saḥ  
vipaṇīmadhyamārgena) gantum prāvartata dvijah ||

In T after „Utsthala” there must, therefore, be inserted this: „with the intention to stay there with his relative (his uncle) Viṣṇudatta, the reverend inmate of the monastery of that island,

<sup>1)</sup> From henceforward the sign Br. denotes Brockhaus and his edition, D that of Durgaprasād, T Tawney’s translation, t. = taraṅga.

as before. So Çaktideva reached the island and forthwith began to take his way through the bazar. Then by chance etc."

D, in a note on p. 311 of his second edition, notifies that the line, corresponding to t. 60, 93 of Brockhaus, is wanting in one of his MSS. Considering it an interpolation, he has not put it into the text. I think, he is right doing so. In this way the necessity of supposing a hiatus of the former part of cl. 96 disappears; Br. 95 c d and 96 c d belong together, nothing is wanting between those lines, as Br. erroneously believed, in D they are connected, and T II, 32 connected them likewise.

In the *vetāla* nr. 7, t. 81, 15 D in a note gives  $1\frac{1}{2}$  additional cloka which he has not put into the text. Those lines are found in one MS and are not mentioned by Br.

One cloka, t. 103, 159 of D, is wanting in Br. Its addition greatly improves the style. The abrupt transition from the turgid description of the ocean-like host of Mrgāñkadatta and his father-in-law in cl. 157 and 158 to the very plain matter-of-fact content of Br. 159 disappears in this way. D has put this cloka into the text; it fills up a gap, indeed. — Likewise D has two lines more than are found in Br.'s ed. in t. 108, viz. between Br. cl. 154 a b and c d; this additional cloka depicts the beauty and loveliness of the maiden Vāyuvegayaçns. They are quite appropriate to the situation and I hold them for genuine.

After t. 123, 260 there is a gap of sundry clokas which Br. did not realize. It is disclosed by D's text. We detect the gap by putting together the parallel places in Kathās. and Br̥hkm. Kusumāyudha, pupil of a learned brāhmaṇa, had fallen in love with the daughter of this teacher. She answered his love, but having been promised to another suitor, told him to cause her to be carried off. A servant of his whom he had ordered to take her with a mule, treacherously desiring to keep her for himself, conducted her to some distant place, not to his master; then he told her, he was going to marry her himself. On beholding herself in his power, the girl cunningly feigns to acquiesce to that sudden change of husband; but, she says, you must marry me duly and in good order; go and fetch the requisites for the nuptial ceremony. Meanwhile he set out to the next town to buy the necessary things, she fled with the mule to the dwelling of a garland-maker, who concealed her. In Br.'s Kathās. the feigned assent of the maiden is only indicated by the half-cloka: *çrulraitat sābravīt prājñā: „tvam hi me sutaram priyah”* (cl. 260 c d), the next line relates his going to the town to make purchases. D inserts here between both one

çloka, the former part of which is *tvam evātra na kiṁ sadyah pariñeyo 'sy aho mama*, the latter part is lost. It is, however, obvious that there is lost more. Cp. this parallel in Br̥hkm. (p. 404, cl. 35 foll.):

*pracchādyā vr̥aha: ko doṣas tvam mamābhyaḍhikāḥ priyāḥ ||  
kiṁ tūcītavidhānena tvayodvāham ahaṁ bhaje;*

*ānayotsavasāmagrīm tvam vikri\*ṅguliyakam<sup>1)</sup> ||* (36)

*iti ḡrutvā gate tasmiṁsataḥ Kamalalocanā  
viveča trāsāt svadhiyā mālākāraṇineçanam ||* (37)

If we consider that Kṣemendra has much shortened here, we must conclude to the loss of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  or  $2\frac{1}{2}$  çlokas at least, which contained her conditions and the suggestion to buy the marriage implements.

The line t. 124, 111 cd Br. is not found in D. It is, in fact, a dittography of cl. 109 cd; cl. 112 Br. is in D the second part of 111 and Br.'s erroneous signs of quotation must disappear.

For the rest the differences of reading are not great and move between limits sufficiently narrow as to make it plain that there can hardly be question of more than one redaction. Instances of variances bearing to whole çlokas are none, except t. 88, 36, where the same fact is said with quite different words in Br. and in D. Other instances of minor importance are 18, 189, 44, 66, 59, 82 (D's reading is here much better), 94, 51 (here the Calcutta MS considerably differs from both Br. and D) and 116, 49. The last passage deserves a more accurate exposition.

Padmāvatī learns from her attendance that the young man in her presence who has rescued her from the two giantesses, is the very prince destined by her father to be her husband. She is extremely rejoiced by that news, and likewise the young man is delighted. The çloka descriptive of their mutual feeling, is in Br. as follows:

*tato 'nyonya-parijñāna-harṣa-pūrṇe nijātmani*

*„yuktam yad adya 'iha 'āyāva!" iti kumāri-varāv ubhau ||*

in T's translation (II, 525): Then the princess and her lover had their hearts filled with joy at discovering one another, and they both thought, „it is well that we came here to-day." Here the absence

<sup>1)</sup>) The akṣara lost and marked as such in the printed text, may be *yā*; I conjecture *vikri<yā>ṅguliyakam*.

of the word meaning *thought* in the original is somewhat strange, though not impossible. But D has a quite different reading, doubtless the right one:

*yuktam t ad yan na mātah sma tau kumārīvarāv ubhau*  
„it was a matter of course that they could not contain themselves (for joy).” Cp. 22, 131 *na māti sma mudā kvacit*. The comparative rareness of the idiom *na māti* with that meaning may be a factor in the origin of the various reading.

Another instance of a genuine reading ousted by its difficulty is t. 18, 189. The gallant Vidūṣaka, having rescued the princess and placed her into her private apartments, is taking his leave, but she does not allow it; „stay with me”, she says: „when you are gone, this breath of me will leave my body overcome with fear.” Whereupon he resolves to remain, reflecting thus [T. I, 134]: „If I go, and leave this maiden, she may possibly die of fear. The original line in question translated thus by T from Br.’s text, is: *tyaktvemām yadi gacchāmi muñcet prāṇān bhayād iyam*. D has a lectio difficilior, viz. *yad astu me na gacchāmi* etc. = „happen what may, I remain; she might possibly die of fear”. The idiom *yad astu* = come, what will, fr. *advienne que pourra*, has given way in most MSS, it seems, to a somewhat synonymous turn of phrase, more common but less forcible. In the other instances, where it occurs, it has, however, kept its place: 27, 86. 58, 123. 71, 133; 153. 73, 156. 84, 21. 101, 308. 113, 40. *Yad bhavatu* with the same meaning is met with 33, 45 and 57, 161; likewise *yad vidhattām vidhir mama* 57, 99, and *yathā cāstu* 101, 135. I have enumerated these instances, because they represent also a syntactical peculiarity not registered elsewhere. It is of course an elliptical turn: *yad astu (bhavatu)* is a brachylogical form of *yad astu*, *astu*; *yad bhavatu*, *bhavatu*. A slight variation of it is exhibited 119, 86 Br. *yad b h a v i t ā* = ‘quod futurum est’ sc. fiat; but D instead of *yad bhaviteti* has *yad bhavatī*, evidently a false reading.

A few times the variances concern some rare or provincial word, for which in part of the mss. a more common word has been substituted, as *mecaka* 124, 197 D (*cyāmāla* Br.); *hevāki* 121, 237 D, cp. T II, 584, n. 1 (*Jayantaḥ* Br.); likewise 1, 25 D

*priyaprāṇayah evāki yato mānavatimanaḥ.*

Br. has *priyaprāṇahetvartham*, the vitiated reading.

Finally I remind of the various reading in the first stanza of the *prācasti* at the end of the work and edited in D. Br. did not

take it up in his edition, I cannot understand for what reason, for he found it in his MSS. WEBER in his Catalogue of MSS, vol. II (1886) p. 161 repaired the omission of the editor of Kathās., publishing the *pracasti* in extenso with the discrepancies of the Berlin MSS. So we know that king Saṅgrāmarāja of Kashmir, the forefather of king Ilarśa, in whose reign Somadeva composed his poem, is connected in some MSS with Sātavāhana, in others, it seems, not so. The MSS (marked by Br.) H and S begin the *pracasti* thus: *çrīSātavāhanakulāmbudhipārijātaḥ Saṅgrāmarāja iti*, and this is also the reading adopted by D. But in the MS W the first pāda is: *samgrāmalabdhaçaçicubhrayaçoritānah*, what is materially different. It looks as if the reputed descent from the legendary king Sāta-(or Sāli)vāhana was disbelieved by some who changed the words of Somadeva accordingly.

## § 2.

While perusing Br., I was stricken by the comparatively great number of verses in that edition that sin against the laws of the metre. *All of them, without exception, are edited in D without fault.* In 191 cases his verses are too short, in 60 they are too long. Here is the list of them:

too short: 2, 39. — 3, 38. 48. — 7, 111 (*vasantatilaka*). — 10, 45. — 12, 24. 157. — 13, 142. — 14, 11. 74. — 18, 260. 320. 323. — 20, 173. 183. 221. — 22, 195. — 24, 43. 64. — 25, 60. 112. 140. — 26, 201. 229. — 27, 79. — 28, 66. — 30, 121. — 31, 62. — 33, 26. — 36, 5. — 37, 234. — 39, 10. 29. 175. — 40, 28. — 42, 90. 191. — 43, 133. — 44, 165. — 45, 115. — 46, 16. 74. 112. 147. — 47, 84. 118. — 48, 54. 63. — 49, 35. 231 [= 229 D]. — 50, 35<sup>1</sup>). 130<sup>1</sup>). 172<sup>1</sup>). 206<sup>1</sup>). [*vasantatilaka*]. — 51, 60. 130. 151. — 52. 243. 314. — 53, 93. — 54. 41. 53. 61. 105. 210. — 55, 222. — 56, 34. 184. 313<sup>1</sup>). 335<sup>1</sup>). 338<sup>1</sup>). 349<sup>1</sup>). — 57, 70. 135. 151. — 58, 133. — 59, 61. 113. 129. — 60, 74. 217<sup>1</sup>). 232<sup>1</sup>). 244<sup>1</sup>). — 61, 256. — 62, 128. 216. — 63, 22. 59. 141. — 65, 101. 225. 241. — 66, 21. 43. 51. — 69, 27. 60. 116. 132. 170. —

<sup>1</sup>) In D the cipher of the çloka must be diminished with one.

70, 36. 46. — 71, 19. 101. 158. 218. 287. — 72.  
 65. 75. 173. 301. 350. 392. — 73, 8. 178. 291.  
 403. 438. — 74, 222. 227. — 75, 123. — 77, 32.  
 56. — 80, 6 (see T's note at II, 261). 10. — 81,  
 21. 48. — 82, 15. — 86, 57. 85. 122. 128. — 90,  
 13. — 92, 2. 22. 38. — 93, 94. — 94, 132. —  
 95, 16. 51. 52. 66. 91. — 97, 27. — 101, 32. —  
 102, 48. — 103, 172. — 104, 111 [= 110 D]. —  
 105, 29. 47. 53. 63. — 106, 48. — 107, 25. 118.  
 123. — 108, 180 [= 181 D]. 109, 49. 60. 94. 142. —  
 110, 22<sup>1)</sup>. 63. 89. 123. — 111, 60. — 112, 165. —  
 113, 48. 82. — 114, 67. 83. 104. — 115, 3. 82.  
 146. — 117, 166. — 118, 20. 179. — 119, 5. 67.  
 108. 115. — 121, 24. 44. 118. — 123, 67. 200.  
 221. 247. 322. — 124, 105. 214 [= 213 D].

too long: 1, 36. 57. — 6, 56<sup>2)</sup>. — 10, 92. — 11, 64. — 17,  
 80. — 18, 153. 316. — 21, 112. 116. — 25, 160. —  
 26, 12. — 30, 48. — 34, 95. — 38, 27. — 39,  
 105. 236. — 40, 22. — 43, 252 (āryā). 256 (cārdūlav.).  
 274 (upagīti). — 44, 73. — 45, 142. — 49, 4. 21. —  
 50, 88 [= 87 D]. — 52, 111. 331. — 55, 55<sup>2)</sup>. 232. —  
 60, 32. — 64, 132. — 65, 157. 167. 254. — 66,  
 35. — 71, 221. — 72, 305. 356. — 74, 153. —  
 77, 53. — 86, 143. — 92, 57. 81. — 96, 34. —  
 98, 44. — 101, 127. 208. — 104, 153 [= 152 D]. —  
 110, 73. — 114, 99. — 115, 26. — 116, 55. —  
 117, 40. 95. — 118, 108. 123. — 119, 28. — 120,  
 66. — 123, 110.

The total of these inaccuracies bears on a little more than 1% of all the verses, which proves a want of exactness not so great in itself, yet considerable enough to make us in some measure diffident as to the trustworthiness of Br. as a witness of the tradition of manuscripts. In some cases even trisyllable words are dropped, as: 49, 231. 73, 438. 80, 6. 108, 180. 114, 83. 123, 200. Elsewhere, as may occur in mss. by oversight of the scribes, he leaves out one of two words similar to one another, e.g. 52, 314 *puspāt* before *puspam*; 39, 10 *tatra* after *ekatra*. A remarkable case of *pramāda* is 59, 129 a: Br. reads that line:

*drṣṭvā Somaprabham, „ko 'yam?" ity aprcchyata.*

<sup>1)</sup> In D *nivirṛtya* is an error of print for *vinirṛtya*.

<sup>2)</sup> Br. has *svaryam* for *svāryam*, and *prthivyām* instead of *prthvyām*.

From D it appears that the genuine text is:

*dr̥ṣṭvā Somaprabham ko 'yam iti svairam apr̥cchyata.*

Consequently Br. not only dropped the word *svairam* but applied the sandhi to *iti* + *apr̥cchyata* without becoming aware that he destroyed the metre. — At 25, 60 Satyavrata being asked, whether he knew Goldcity, answers:

*kim tu dr̥ṣṭvā bahudvīpadṛ̥çvanāpi na sā mayā  
nagari tvadabhipretā dvipāntesu çrutā punah ||*

„though I have visited many islands I never saw the city which you are longing for, yet I have heard of it while staying in the farthest islands”. This is the right text of D; Br., whether owing to bad readings of his mss. or a mistake of his own, represents it as follows: *kim tu dr̥ṣṭā bahudvīpā dr̥ṣṭā 'adya* [his peculiar analysis of *dr̥ṣṭā'adya*] *na sā mayā* etc., spoiling not only the verse of one syllable, but eclipsing at the same time an interesting instance of a compound with *°dṛ̥çvan* according to Pāṇini 3, 2, 94. — In the same t. 25, at cl. 112 Br. edits, with the omission of one syllable, *abhravidyudāpātadāruṇam*, where he had to put *anabhra*°, as of course D has; by this oversight he impairs the poetical expression, for Somadeva does not say, as T translates according to Br.'s text, „an attack of the fire of grief, terrible like the falling of lightning from a cloud”, but „— from a cloudless sky,” a frequent image in poetry.

Tar. 69, 138 where Br. edited the last pāda *pacyams tām eva unmanāḥ*, his mistake and, in consequence of it, his disturbing both the rule of sandhi and the metre, was caused by a misreading. For *unmanāḥ* D has *tan manāḥ*, and now all is right. Another instance of the same fault, but in inverse sense, is 24, 54 *udaghosyata* (D), Br. *tad agh*°.

The misreading coincides here with vitiation of the metre. Apart from the metre Brockhaus must have made such mistakes many times; part of the better readings of D do not correct faults of the manuscripts but of the editor. It is of course not possible nor of great utility to try to draw the boundary between the two sources of errors. It may, however, be useful to mention in general the causes of confusion and consequently of depravation in Br.'s text.

*dy* and *gh* are confounded 57, 1, see WEBER, *Verzeichniss* etc. (1886) p. 159 n. 2.

*s* and *m*: (e. g. 102, 113 *sa samānayat* for *samamānayat*).

*sv* and *kh*: 106, 110 (*kheda* for *sveda*).

*v* and *dh*: 12, 49 (*dhṛtavān* for *vrtavān*); 26, 17 (*dhārayāmi* for *vārayāmi*); 49, 2 (*dhīra* for *vīra*).

- v* and *n*: 45, 232 (*pravṛttām* is to be corrected into *pranṛttām* D. Prahlāda beheld „her dancing” not her „who came forward to dance”, as T I, 425 translated, misled by Br.). So 15, 82 (*nigojitaḥ* for *vi°*); 59, 46 (*vyadhāt* for *nyadhāt*); 23, 40 (Br. *vidhim avāpsyasi*, it ought to be *nidhim*, cp. 45 *nidhānam*); 74, 221 (*nivartita°* for *vivartita°*; the same blunder 104, 32. 113, 65. 123, 58).
- n* and *t* 119, 200 (Br. *na paçyanti* instead of *tapasyanti* D and T). 86, 111 (*anāyantā* for *anāyatā*, as Kern corrected already in 1868). Sometimes the particle of interrogation *nu* has become to *tu*, as 54, 258 (D has here also the corrupt reading). 71, 57. 78, 107.
- nn* and *tr.* Br. put *tatra* for *tan na* 46, 178. 101, 230. 106, 157, and inversely 106, 90. Cp. also 105, 73. A somewhat comic result of that interchange is met with 65, 46, where Br. makes a Bodhisattva gratify living beings and Piçācas by „presents of water and jewels” (T II, 104), while the poet meant *jalair annaiḥ* (with water and food) not *jalai ratnaiḥ*, as we read in Br. The same mistake impairs 66, 154. Instead of *dhanai ratnaiç ca* (Br.) D has *dhanair annaiç ca*; the evident meaning of the passage is clear from cl. 153 *presayām āsa . . . pakvānnāni dhanāni ca*. An instance of putting *tra* into the text instead of *ni* occurs 57, 106.
- t* and *bh*: *abhi* for *ati* 38, 115; inversely t. 99, 50 Br. has wrongly *atyatusyat* for *abhyatusyat* (D). At 77, 13 Br. misread *sabhyam* ‘judge, umpire’, and put *satyam* into his text, D rendered to the verse its true wording *niccayāyātha sabhyam tam rājaputram upeyathuh*. The inverse error, *sabhya* for *satya*, occurs 56, 247. The plain and appropriate expression of this cloka  
*tac chrutvā divyahamsam sā matvā s a t y ā bhibhāśinam*  
*mumoca Damayanti tam evam astv iti vādinī ||*  
as it is edited in D<sup>1)</sup>, is miserably perplexed in Br., where the word *sabhyābhibhāśinam* deceived Tawney, who (I, 560) translates: „she thought that the celestial swan was a polished speaker” instead of ‘— spoke the truth’. Here Boehltingk detected the mistake of Br., see Petr. Dict. VII, 674 s. v. *sabhya* in fine.
- r* and *ri*: 10, 107 (*tr̥taya* for *tritaya*). 26, 269 Br. = 271 D (*tr̥su* for *trisū*). Likewise *r* for *ra*: 108, 187, see T II, 459 n. 3. Other samples may be 58, 139 *tataḥ sa sa mprāpya punah*

<sup>1)</sup> Where it is cl. 246.

*svarājyam* (Br. spoils this line editing *tataḥ samāṃ prāpya* etc); 68, 11 *udghātāt*, misread by Br. as *udvātāt*, see PWK<sup>1)</sup> I, 234 s. v. *udvāta*; 88, 52 *sucubhād api karmāṇah* (D), where Br. has *svacubhād*; 103, 5 where Br. against the obvious sense put *caspeṣu* instead of *sasyeṣu*; the wrong reading *uṣma* for *uṣṇa* at 87, 30 and 124, 136 Br. [= 135 D], cp. T's note on II, 619; the confounding of *anusvāra* with *r* and *e* at 19, 73 and 25, 204 — in the former place D has *mātimardabbhayo*<sup>o</sup>, in the latter *te* (Br. *tam*) —; 7, 84 *samutpāṭya* Br. seems to represent a misread *samutsārya* (D); 43, 13 *saptaka* (Br.) a misread *mastaka* (D) and 73, 7 *Vicitrakatham atha tam* (Br.) a misread *Vicitrakathasanjñākam* (D).

Mistakes such as: putting *eva* for *iva* (13, 147, 25, 102, 55, 131, 120, 62) or inversely (111, 76); *evam* for *ekam* (123, 171); *eta* for *eka* (25, 197); *hṛta* for *hata* (20, 226, 75, 95) or inversely (84, 8); *apekṣ* for *upekṣ* (17, 12) or inversely (70, 17); *apakriyā* for *upakriyā* (93, 68); *ayam* for *aham* (21, 25, 24, 169); *vismṛtā* for *vismitā* (34, 216); *gṛu* for *guṇa* or inversely (e. g. 45, 368) and the like may be caused partly by inexact reading of the MSS, partly also by not correcting ordinary clerical errors, wherever common sense convinces them. The ingenuous avowal of Br. in the Preface of the First Volume (p. IX) that he nowhere has put into the text any conjecture not backed by mss. authority, practically resulted towards preferring occasional abdication of his intellectual faculties to disregarding a palpable corrupt tradition in the mss. which he happened to have the use of.

The confusion between *b* and *v* and between the different sibilants in his MSS made him now and then take a wrong way. Of the former kind t. 123, 175 and 191 afford good instances; in both places Br. writes *janyavalakam*, which should be written *janyabalakam*, as is edited, indeed, in D = 'the company of the bridegroom's friends' (T. II, 602). As to the sibilants, Br. sometimes puts *dāsa* for *dūṣa* 'fisherman' (e. g. 52, 337), *veṣa* for *reṣa*. A remarkable mistake is t. 20, 122 *āṣu ca* (Br.) for *āṣṭa ca* (D), which could be easily made, since *ṣta* and *ṣu* can be very similar in manuscripts; another t. 101, 13 *bīṣāni* spelt *vīṣāni*.

Another source of errors was effected by his singular method of separating the words and wordcomplexes, something very proper to produce errors of any kind. In the 2<sup>d</sup> and 3<sup>d</sup> volumes the

<sup>1)</sup> Henceforward PW denotes the Petropolitan Dictionary, PWK the Petr. Dict. „in kürzerer Fassung“.

necessity of transcription added to this other fresh opportunities of mistakes. In a very great number of places *a* is printed where *ā* is meant or ought to be meant, or inversely. See e. g. T. II, 332 n. 1 — appertains to t. 93, 73 —; PW V, 1468 s. v. *tārāṇa*, VI, 833 s. v. *vas + ā* at the end; t. 107, 118 (*hanta* for *hantā*), all cases of *a* erroneously put for *ā*. — Examples of the inverse mistake are e. g. 42, 93 *rājānītiṁ* (sic Br.) for *rājanītiṁ* (T I, 383 understood it rightly); 52, 334 *phalahakā* for *°ka*. 62, 182. 71, 191. 72, 56; 344. 103, 61, cp. also PW V, 1491 s. v. *dārī*; VII, 414 s. v. *cvaçurya* (t. 89, 57 to be added) and VII, 456 „*sāmyātrika* Kathās. 80, 30 fehlerhaft für *sāmyātrika*”. Even a few instances occur in the first volume with *nāgarī* types: 25, 284 *pāpacārau* for *pāpācārau*, ib. 203 and 17, 93 (see PW I, 739 s. v. *āśidhāra*).

Sometimes the aspirate consonant is erroneously put instead of the non-aspirate one or inversely: 14, 16 (*kh* for *k*). 16, 46. 74, 210. 101, 186 (*dh* for *d*). 19, 65 (*kh* for *k*). 22, 240 (*d* for *dh*, cp. T, I, 185 n., D confirms his emendation). 39, 161 (*b* for *bh*). 46, 199 (*vignā[ḥ]* for *vighnā[ḥ]*). 90, 12 (*adrçyah* for *adhrṣyah*, cp. T II, 308 note). 110, 14 and 98 (*dh* for *d*). A similar kind of error through transcription is *nd* for *ṇd* 9, 7 (*danda* instead of *dāṇḍa*). 9, 9 (*Sāndilya* instead of *Çāndilya*). Once, by a similar inadvertence, writing *l* for *d*, Br. destroys the pointe of a saying (t. 54, 92).

Another kind of mistakes consists in wrongly dividing the *scriptio continua* of his MSS. At 7, 17 Br. edits the second line thus: *sā ca 'avatīrṇā devī twetasya 'eva munikanyakā*, where he had to divide *sā ca 'avatīrṇā devītve tasya 'eva*. At 13, 23 *sahastikapañcamah*, *sa* is erroneously made part of the compound, D. severs it from the rest<sup>1)</sup>; the inverse mistake of separating *sa*, where it is part of a compound, occurs e. g. 15, 109; in the next cl. *tad utsāham* is printed instead of *tadutsāham*. Similar faults are numerous in Br. T I, 400 note writes „I read with a MS in the Sanskrit College — *bhayade hā mūrta iva sāhase*”; Br. had before him the same reading but misunderstood his text, dividing it as follows *bhaya-dehámūrta iva sāhase* (t. 43, 202), which is devoid of sense; of a similar nature are T's notes on I, 442 (t. 46, 172), II, 344 (t. 95, 38 Br.), 398 note 4 (t. 103, 41), 444 note 1 (t. 107, 62) and on p. 406 and 612, T (II, 155) tacitly corrects the

<sup>1)</sup> Cp. also 88, 31. 122, 70. The adj. *sabrahmacārin* is 70, 19 and 71, 29 erroneously into *sa brahmacārin*!

nonsensical reading of 71, 27 Br., and elsewhere. KERN corrected some of these mistakes in his *Remarks* in the *Journal of the Roy. As. Society* of 1868, p. 165 foll. In some cases the wrong analysis would have been concealed, if the editor had used nāgarī types and in the usual way. Of the kind is t. 45, 399 *tattvam* wrongly for *tat tvam*; t. 50, 124

*Devyá 'aham preshitá tvám pratyádishaṭam ca tayá tava,*  
whereas the line must be read *°preṣitá tvám praty ādiṣṭam ca* etc.;  
t. 54, 149

*apaçyan sa çubham lagnam paçyan na çakunāni saḥ,*  
where the obvious meaning of the context compels to divide *paçyann* *çakunāni*, cp. PW VII, 13 s. v. *çakuna* with *a°*; t. 86, 59 *yāvac* *garīram* are two words, not one compound, we have here an instance of the turn *na param . . . yāvat v. a. = „not only . . . but also”*, cp. my *Sanskrit Syntax* § 480 R. 1<sup>1</sup>). Sometimes Br. was wrong in his distribution of two words amalgamated by eventual contraction of final and initial vowel into *ā* (*yā*, *vā*, *rā*). At 94, 97 it is said of a boy seven years old that even at this age he always took pleasure in benefiting his fellow-men; in good Sanskrit this must be expressed . . . *sadā parahite rataḥ*, Br.'s analysis *sadā 'aparahite rataḥ* is against the idiom. Other instances are: 16, 40 (see T's note at I, 111); 25, 200 (*āyāntam* for *yāntam*); 73, 77 (see T's note 2 at II, 195). A similar fault is committed 101, 91 — to read *sthāne khalu*; Br.'s *'sthāne* is impossible, since this should be connected with the preceding words, *khalu* would become the first word of the sentence.

In sundry cases Br.'s erroneous distinction of the *scriptio continua* deceived Tawney. I adduce some instances.

T. 24, 24 king Paropakārin tells his queen that he is troubled with anxiety about a suitable marriage for their daughter Kanakarekhā. The poet makes him use this elegant turn of phrase, that she is growing up together with his care thereabout: *vardhamānā sahai-vaitatsamānovāhacintayā / eṣā Kanakarekhā me hṛdayam, devi, bādhate*. Br. destroyed the savour of the expression, as he edited *vardhamānā 'asahā 'eva, 'etatsamānovāhacintayā* etc., a nonsensical phrase, which prevented T from catching the intention of Somadeva.

Tar. 46, 147 and 148 contain a theory about dreams. They are threefold: one kind of dreams betokens something different from that what is dreamt; a second kind foretells the very

<sup>1</sup>) This turn is frequent in Kathās. See 19, 96. 23, 65. 27, 14. 29, 123. 47, 91. 92, 56. 118, 39.

events which one has seen asleep; a third kind has no significance at all. In the text the three types are distinguished as *parārtha*, *yathārtha* and *apārtha*. In D the two çlokas run thus:

*svapnaç cānekadhā: 'nyārtho yathārtho 'pārtha eva ca;  
yah̄ sadyaḥ sūcayaty artham anyārthah̄ so 'bhidhīyate ||  
prasannadevatādecarūpah svapno yathārthakah̄;  
gādhanubhavacintādikṛtam āhur apārthakam ||*

This is plain and interesting. Br. has edited the former çloka in this corrupted form:

*svapnaç ca 'aneka-dhānyārtho, yathārtho 'pārtha eva ca  
yah̄ sadyaḥ sūcayaty artham dhānyārthah̄ so 'bhidhīyate.*

Is it wonder that Tawney was perplexed how to get any sense out of it? see T I, 441 with note 1.

At 121, 169 Br. finding in his MSS *devāgārekṣayāya* = „for contemplating the temple”, divided it in this manner *devāgāre kṣayāya*, by which T (II, 580) was adduced to translate „took that wicked ascetic] to the temple for a moment”. It suffices to read the whole passage to understand the awkwardness of the reading of Br.

A remarkable misunderstanding of Br. disturbs the meaning of 59, 29. He took the first two syllables of the complex *mayeçvaropayogitvāt* for containing the proper name Maya. Hence T, having to translate these lines:

*devāyām Āstragañjākhyāç caturvedadharah̄ çukah̄, (28)*

*kaviḥ krtsnāsu vidyāsu kalāsu ca vicakṣanah̄*

*mayeçvaropayogitvād ihānito 'dyā, grhyatām (29)*

rendered them as follows: „King, here is a parrot that knows the four Vedas, called Śāstraganja, a poet skilled in all the sciences and the graceful arts, and I have brought him here to-day *by the order of king Maya*, so receive him” (II, 19). The words I have italicized in this translation are to be corrected. There is no question of a king Maya. The Bhilla maiden simply says „I have brought him here” (*maya... ihānīlah̄*) „since he is suitable for a lord” (*içvaropayogitvāt*). In fact, *upayogitva* does not mean „order”, but signifies the being *upayogin* i.e. „suitable, fit, of utility”, cp. 45, 127, 113, 48 (*kim cānyānupayoginyā lukeṣyā vidyudvīlolyā*). — Another instance of a proper name existing only in the idea of Br., but not really found in Somadeva’s poem is Devajñānī 30, 130. Here must be read, as is in D: *deva jñānīti*; *deva* is the voc., and *jñānī* is the subject to be construed with the pronoun *esah̄* in the preceding line.

I could fill some pages more with augmenting the list of errors committed by Br. and corrected in D — in all the instances quoted D's text is right — but what utility may be obtained from it? What I have stated suffices, I believe, to prove that the task which Brockhaus took on his shoulders was inadequate to his abilities, owing for a great deal, certainly, to the disfavour of the time he lived in, when Sanskrit studies encompassed a very limited area and could be neither broad nor deep. Durgaprasād's edition, there can be no question about, has superseded nowadays the European text of the Kathāsaritsāgara, and has become our sole standard edition, to be consulted and quoted up to that future day, when a critical edition in the true sense of these words will have been published.

### § 3.

The question may arise, why I have allowed in the foregoing so much room to expatiating on more or less evident mistakes and faults in an obsolete edition, which has been replaced by a much better one, in which the said errors are set right. I did so firstly, because the necessity of putting aside a text which for some decades of years had enjoyed a great authority among the Sanskritists and was much consulted by them, required a somewhat extensive account of argument. Secondly, it might be of some use to remind editors of the ubiquity of clerical errors in manuscripts, the emendation of which in cases of evidence must not be checked by the fortuitous circumstance that the faultless reading is not found in any of the mss. at the disposal of the editor; certain permutations of akṣaras owing to palaeographical similarity or to likeness of pronunciation *dya* and *gha*; *ma*, *ya*, *pa*, *sa*; *çā* and *sa*; *r* and *ri*; *u* and *va*; *ca* and *va* etc. etc. are so common that a critical editor is not only qualified, but even obliged to bring them into account as a sort of tare when establishing the net weight and the value of the readings with which he happens to meet in a gross form in his manuscripts.

The third and, I dare say, the chief reason that moved me was this. The Petropolitan Dictionary is very much indebted to the Kathāsaritsāgara. Boehltingk took care to profit of the lexicographical materials laid up in that important text, edited by a competent scholar at a time when the number of Sanskrit works in editions of European scholars was comparatively small. The imperfections of Br., which fully came to light by the publication of D, have

left their traces in the Dictionary. Though Boethlingk oftentimes detected and corrected mistakes of Br. — vide e.g. *supra* p. 71. 72. 73 and *infra* p. 77. 80. 84 — it was something impossible for his perspicacity to be misled nowhere. I think it will be of some profit to make up a list of corrections in PW and PWK chiefly owing to the new light cast on the Kathāsaritsāgara by D's edition. In doing which I follow the alphabetical order.

#### List of corrections to be made in PW and PWK.

*amṛcavatara* = °*taraṇa* occurs 22, 1 D. The reading of Br. °*vatāra*° implies a metrical blunder.

*ativāhya* 18, 106 is to be cancelled and *ativāha* to be put in its place. D has *nicātivāhayogya* ‘proper to pass the night’.

*animitta* 121, 181 ‘evil omen’, a meaning omitted by mistake.

*anīkinī* 47, 42; dele the asterisk in PWK.

*anunāyana* the ἔπειξ εἰρημένον t. 14, 89 does not exist. D has *anunāthana* (from *nāth* *nāthate* ‘to beseech’) which must be substituted for it. From *anu* + *nī* the nomen actionis ought to be *anunayana*, not °*nāyana*.

*anupattrikā* 71, 111 ‘etwa Brief’ PW VII, 1694. The word seems to take its origin from a blunder of Br. D reads the last pāda of that çloka *haste dattvānuyātrikān* ‘having given an escort in his hand’. Likewise

*anupātinī* 73, 410 is to be cancelled. D has *prakṛtir anuyāyinī*. *anuposana* 48, 101 has been forgotten.

*anveṣa* with the meaning of ‘investigator, inquirer’ is to be added from 123, 310 D (= 309 Br.). Br. has *anvestum*, but D's reading *anveṣān* is preferable. T (II, 609) was perplexed by the infin.

*apayantranām* adv., a new word, 104, 34 D. Br. has *aniyantranām*. The asterisk before *asra* with the meaning ‘blood’ may be put away; D and the India Off. MSS read so at 114, 88, Br. reads *asry*°. Cp. T II, 543 note 1.

*asvāsthym* is the reading of D in the two places 101, 89 and 117, 90, whereas Br. reads *āsvasthyam* (see PW V, s. v.).

*āp* + *prati* desid.: PW V, 1108 „werben um (ein Mädchen) *tvat-svāmyartham pratipsa tām*”. This unaccountable signification of the desid. of *prati* + *āp* is false. Br. did not understand the passage. D reads the line in question: *etadartham tvam āhūtas tvatsvāmyartham pratipsatā* (sc. *maya*), and is

evidently right in doing so. The *ə̄pi. ə̄p*, *pratīpsati* is here synonymous with *abhipsatī*, as might be expected a priori. *āhvātavya* PW V, 1134 „adj. herbeizurufen Kathās. 110, 141 eine ungrammatische Form“. D has the regular gerund *āhvātavya!* cp. PWK I, 197.

As to *udghāta* and *upodyghāta* t. 71, 295, I refer to the following chapter.

*uparibhūmi* subst. 58, 70 not mentioned neither in PW nor in PWK. The latter mentions only *uparibhūmī* adv.

*upasamkhyā* PW V, 1194 and PWK I, 245, which Boehlingk was at a loss how to explain, must be cancelled. For *upasamkhyaiḥ*, t. 74, 278 Br., D has *upasamkhyām*. The right reading, I think, is *upasamkhyam* = ‘towards the battle, -the war’, an avyayībhāva. T II, 228 has found out the right explication of this cloka.

*umbhita*, quoted from t. 51, 186 in PW V, 1200 s. v. *ubh*, is a good correction of Boehlingk; Br. has *ratnastambhobhitābhogam*. The correction is confirmed by D. And not only here, but also in three places more *umbhita* has been restored in D, where Br. had failed to recognize that participle: 49, 4 (*sunirmalagūṇombhitaiḥ*, Br. *gūṇavītaīḥ*); 74, 135 (*vidyā... saptākṣarombhitā*, Br. *onmitā*); 117, 14 (*tatra ratnombhastambha°*, Br. *tatra ratnasthitastambha°*!). It may be rendered ‘made up of’, ‘beset with’. I think it is indeed, as is commonly accepted, akin to the idg. root \**vebh*, \**ubh*, the offspring of which *ūrvavābhi* is a welcome guest in linguistic handbooks. Of the Rigveda instances quoted in PW I, s. v. *ubh* I hold but one for belonging to this root *ubh*, viz. RV 4, 1, 15; the other two having a quite different meaning — 1, 63, 4 *Vrtram.... ubhnāḥ* ‘you killed [or: vexed, or: oppressed] Vrtra’ and similarly 4, 19, 4, cp. Sāyaṇa on both passages — must be referred to another root *ubh*.

*ullāghayati* ‘to heal’. Tar. 72, 407 is a new instance to be added to the two recorded in PW V, 1204 and PWK I, 253. D and T's Calcutta MS read *ullāghayan*, see T II, 191 note; in Br. it has been corrupted into *ullaṅghayan*. I found also a good instance in Tantrākhyāyika (ed. Hertel) II, 77.

*ekakā* and *ekikā*. The distribution of these two forms of the fem. of *ekaka*, instanced PW V, 1217 from Kathās., is the same in both Br. and D. Only add t. 73, 196, where D has *ekikā*, Br. *ekakā*.

*kampyra*. A new instance of this adj. is t. 52, 49 D *kopakam-prāṅgasamdhikam*. This is preferable to *kopakampā*° Br. Cp. *dipra* infra.

*karṇin* PW II, 127. Cancel the meaning 2. b) „Steuermann, Schiffmann Kathās. 25, 68”. It rests on the bad reading of Br. D reads: *sādhayisyati cātra te / iṣṭam dvipāntarāgacchadavāṇikkārṇaparamparā*. The term *karṇaparamparā* = ‘oral tradition, hearsay’ is well known and recorded in PW, even from the Kathās.

*karṇiratha* ‘covered litter’. To the few instances registered in PW and PWK we may add Kathās. 27, 168, where it is found in both editions, and two more passages met with only in D — the second of then also in T’s MS —: 94, 91 and 120, 118; Br. in both cases failing to recognize the word, has torn it asunder, destroying the sense.

*karṇejapa*, as taught by Pāṇini (3, 2, 13) and recorded in PW and PWK occurs Kathās. 60, 54 D. The form *karṇajapa* found in Br. is a monstrum lectionis, and must be cancelled in PW V, 1258 and in PWK II.

*kalanā* s. v. *kalana* PW V, 1265. The proposal of Boehtl. to correct the meaningless reading of t. 100, 57 Br. *dr̥cān kalatayā girā* etc. is superseded by the right reading of D *dr̥cāk u li-tāyā girā pramadamantha rārambhayā* „with eyes troubled (by agitation) and a voice faltering with joy”.

*kākaçānkin* 32, 52 must be registered in the lexicon as a nickname for a superstitious person who sees omens in everything.

*kācara* PW V, 1275 is also found t. 20, 108 D (Br. *kātara*) and t. 123, 164 D (Br. *kekara*): *kācarākṣīm* and *kācaralocanah*.

*kārmana*. A good instance of *kārmana* = ‘sorcery’ is t. 26, 198 D *tatra cāpaçyad ekāki sādhitānekākārmanam . . . mahāvratinam ekakam*. The word is hidden under a corruption apud Br.

*kārṣaka* is instanced PW V from t. 62, 20; 23 Br. D has here *kārsika*; the same form occurs in both editions 61, 7; 9.

*kinnari* as name of a musical instrument 37, 64 D, where Br. has *kinnarā* cp. PW II, 284; to be added in PWK s. v. 3 b).

„*Kosalā* f. Kathās. 56, 415” PW V, 1332 is to be cancelled. Br. wrongly adopted a vicious reading of one or more of his MSS. D reads in this stanza (414 of his ed.) *jagāma Koçalān*, as it ought to be.

*kōṣṭhaṣṭha* t. 49, 68 Br. is doubtless a corrupted reading; D reads *kōṭṭhaṣṭham* *Somakeçvaram*.

*klibāyase* t. 104, 126 Br. The reading of D is *klibāyase*, a form,

not registered in PW nor PWK, but more conform to the rules of grammar.

*kṣam* caus. PW II, 532 adduces one instance from the Rāmāyaṇa for the meaning „etwas geduldig ertragen”. Lest one might acknowledge another instance in Kathās. 39, 236 Br. *kṣamayasva*, I observe that the line in which this imperative occurs is too long by one syllable. D reads that line: *tātāparādham ekam tvam kṣam asva isām kṛpām kuru* and so restores both the metre and the idiom.

*galla*, a prākritism for *gaṇḍa*, is illustrated by a few instances from literature in PW V, s.v. Add to them Kathās. 63, 185, where D *utpinocchūnagallam* is evidently right (Br. has *°galam*), cp. APTE's Dict. s.v. and the instance produced from Kāvya-prakāṣṭa, a parallel to the Kathās. passage.

*graha* as a nomen actionis is treated in PW II and PWK II s.v. under c.) In PW c ९ the meaning „Kampfanstrengung” = *ranodyama* is taken from dictionaries, not instanced from literature. An excellent instance is Kathās. 50, 53 D, where Brahmā urges Indra to cease the hostilities: *samdhim kuruta kim graha iḥ* „make peace, what have you to do with endeavours to fight one another?” Br. has here a somewhat bewildering reading *samdhim kuruta vigraha iḥ* (50, 54 Br.). *grāhika* quoted as *ἄπαξ εἰρημένον* from t. 49, 16 Br. in PW II „hartnäckig auf etwas bestehend”. D reads here *grahika*, likewise an *ἄπ. εἰρ.*

The interesting word *ghanāghana*<sup>1)</sup> occurs t. 16, 121 D, where Br. *ghanāgama* is manifestly the bad reading.

*ghrā + anu*, (to kiss) instanced in PW VII, 1403 with one place in Kathās. (113, 50), must be cancelled. Br.'s text is here corrupted by a misreading; D *pitroḥ pādāv anudhyāya* ‘honouring his father-and-mother's feet’.

*cavi*, *cavī* PW II, 983 „a kind of pepper.” The instance adduced there from Kathās. 6, 151 is owing to a mistake of Br. and must be cancelled. Instead of the nonsensical *Caravarmā cavihastāḥ* D has *vihastāḥ Caravarmā ca*; *vihasta* = „perplexed, at a loss” (PWK VI, 140 s.v. 1 d)<sup>2)</sup>. Other instances in Somadeva are 90, 48 (*vihastatā*) and the participle *vihastita* (104, 98).

*cirandhi* PW V, 1423 quoted from Kathās. 58, 56 and repeated

<sup>1)</sup> Cp. *Album Kern*, p. 43.

<sup>2)</sup> BÖHTLINGK apud LANMAN, Sanskrit Reader, p. 52 corrected *Caravarmā ca vihastāḥ*.

in PWK II, 132 does not exist at all. D reads here *ciranṭīṣu*, conformably to the form known by grammarians and lexicographers. We have here the „Belegstelle” from literature for *ciranṭī* „old spinster”. The word, methinks, is a prākritism and a *tadbhava* of skrt. *cirayantī* (*υστεροῦσα*), which has got the special meaning of „staying (too) long (at the paternal home, instead of being transported to the home of a husband)”.

*cira* PW V, 1423. Boehltingk's suspicion that *cira* Kathās. 73, 240 (Br. and D) should be corrected into *cīrī* is fully confirmed by the parallel passage t. 87, 32, where D and T's Ms. (see his note 2 at II, 295) agree in reading *cīcītikāra* against *cīra*° Br. At 73, 240 the same must be corrected by conjecture.

*chātvā* 62, 213 Br. is obscure. Some villagers, it is told, took a buffallo belonging to a certain man and *nītvā vaṭatale chātvā vāte vyāpādyā bhakṣitah* [viz. *mahiṣas taiḥ*]. Instead of this out-of-place absolutive D reads *bhillaiḥ*. The villagers were Bhils.

Of *jhampa* and ‘*pā* ‘jump’ (see PWK III, 281) but one instance is quoted from Kathās. in PW, V s. v. There are two more, but Br. has them not, since they are hidden under corrupt readings. The former is t. 103, 8; in D it runs thus:

*utphelur bhallalūnāni cirāmsi bhujaçalinām  
divi dattvordhvajahampāni divyastrir iva cumbitum*

(„....jumping, as if it were, upward to the sky to kiss the heavenly maidens”) [Br. *utpetur..... bhruvaçalinām..... dattvordhvaja-pānadivyastrir* (sic, or is here some hypothetical error?). And t. 115, 68 D has *dattajhampo 'patad bhuvi* (cp. T II, 517 n. 4).

*damara* t. 100, 44 Br. (see PW, V s. v.) is a bad reading. D has *jaya tāndavādambarāmaradā*°. Transport this quotation to *dambara*, cp. 107, 5.

°*daghna* ‘reaching to’. Add to the few instances from literature mentioned PW, III s. v., Kathās. 101, 291 D *gulphadaghn-oçhaladdhūlau* (Br. *gulphalagno*°), cp. T II, 381 n. 2.

*daridryo* t. 49, 210 Br. is a misprint for *daridro* (49, 208 D), cp. T I, 469, n. Happily PW does not record the vitiated word.

*dipra*, taught by Pāṇini 3, 2, 167 and exemplified by the Kāçikā with *dipram kāṣṭam*, occurs five times in the Kathās., once in t. 25, where it is found in both editions, which place is

registered in PW III s. v., and four times in the latter part of the poem, where it stands only in D, not in Br.: t. 101, 28. 106, 61; 182. 110, 14 (Br. everywhere changed, it seems, *dīpra* into *dīpta*).

*durjana*, as adj. PW, V 1500. Its fem. is met with t. 39, 226; Br. reads *rājnīḥ* . . . *durjanāḥ* (acc. pl.), but D *durjanīḥ*. *duhsarpa* ‘eine böse Schlange’ quoted from t. 99, 46 in PW, V 1505 is a misreading. Br. divided the words of the line wrongly. In D 99, 46 c and d run thus: *tat te prītyā vacmi yat tat kuruṣva! / tvam me bandhuḥ sarpadamçārtihartā* „therefore perform what I tell you moved by friendship! you are my relative, you who have relieved me from the distress caused by the bite of the serpent”. T’s (II, 361) translation is accordingly to be rectified.

*dhar + sam + vi*, causative ‘to suspend (a punishment)’ Kathās. 27, 31 lacks in PW and PWK.

*dhārūdhirūḍha*, rightly interpreted by Boehltingk (PW, III s. v.) notwithstanding Br.’s mistake in t. 6, 62, also occurs t. 84, 9.

*dhārmika* with the special meaning of „pious-, religious man, devotee” to be instanced with Kathās. 66, 8 foll.

*Dhṛtatāla* is registered = *Vetāla* in PW, V s. v. from Kathās. 89, 115. D has here *Vetālah* instead of *Dhṛtatālah*.

*dhyā + pra + ni* PW, III and V s. v. The instance quoted V, 1529 from Kathās. 101, 155 is false; D has: *atha sa pranidhāy aitām . . . abravīt*. The other instance taken from the Bhāgavatapurāṇa must likewise be wrong; *pranidadhyau* is a miswritten or misread *pranidadhau*.

*nakṣatramālā* = ‘string of (27) pearls’. PW gives but one instance from literature of this meaning. It is met with in Kathās. four times: 91, 31. 94, 62. 100, 1 (with a double meaning). 118, 164.

*narmada* adj. ‘jesting’ is wholly out of place Kathās. 56, 365 Br., whence it has been instanced PW, IV 64. In D (56, 364) Damayantī says more conformably to the situation: *tat tadā-nayane yuktir manmatā kriyatām iyam* („. . . the contrivance which I have approved”).

*nāmagāṇaka* 61, 252 D „a would-be astrologer, an astrologer nominally, not really”. This ḷṭ. εἰρ. is to be added to the two other examples of compounds of this type: *nāmanau* and *nāmayajña*. Br. failed to see that *nāmagāṇakah* l. l. is one word, he wrongly divided *nāma ganakah*.

*nivāsaka* = *nivāsa* 28, 141 Br. and D is wanting in the Dictionary. *nīraṅgi* ‘veil’. A new instance of this rare and decti-word is 71, 167 D *tām Kamalākara upayeme sanīraṅgim*, „K. wedded her, who had veiled her face”. D explains the word in a foot-note *mukhācchādanavastram nīraṅgity ucyate*. Br. *upayeme sa gaurāṅgim*<sup>1</sup>.

*pādapā* = ‘shoe’ is recorded in PW, V. But also the masc. *pādapa* occurs in this meaning Kathās. 67, 97 (both Br. and D); this is wanting in PW and PWK.

*pāṣandā*. The fem. *ī* occurs 61, 290 Br. (cp. PWK III, s. v.); D reads *pākhandā* for *pāṣandā*.

*piñjarika* (name of some musical instrument) registered in PW V, 1600 from t. 65, 75; 78 Br., is written *piñjaraka* in D. *prāsthānika*, not *prasthānika*, as in Br.’s ed., is indeed found t. 31, 38 D, cp. PW IV, s. v. *prāsthānika*. I think, *kṛta-prāsthānikā* means „after performing the auspicious rite connected with the undertaking of a journey”, cp. the passages from Rāmāyaṇa and Raghuvamṣa quoted in PW l.l. and the word *māngalika* infra. Tawney (I, 278) translates as if it simply meant ‘setting out’.

*preṣṭha*. To the few instances of this superl. may be added t. 104, 45 D (*pūrvam preṣṭhāya*, Br. *pūrraprītāya*).

1. *phal + ut* in PWK, III s. v. The meaning ‘to bounce up’ instanced there with a passage of the Bālārāmāyaṇa, is also met with Kathās. 108, 132 D *hāro ’mitagater vakṣasy utphalañ ḡasataḥ kruḍhā*. Br. hat *utphullāḥ*, an evident corruption, of course.

*balirāja* t. 95, 4 means, I suppose, ‘tributary king’. Cp. the note on this cloka in Chapt. II.

*bāndhavī* PW V, 1647 and PWK, IV s. v. 2) must be cancelled. The sole instance given of it, Kathās. 121, 243 Br., is not confirmed by D. Instead of *bhartṛbāndhavyai* it has *bhartṛ-bāndhavyān* [*mrgam* etc., the abl. of the abstract noun *bāndhavya*, not the dative of an hypothetical *bāndhavī*.

*bhā* ‘to please’ is not found in PW, in PWK s. v. it is recorded and exemplified with one instance from Boehtlingk’s *Chresth*<sup>2</sup> 227, 8 [= (Kāç.’s) schol. on Pāṇini 2, 3, 2] *bubhukṣitam na prati bhāti kiṁcit*, and Boehtl. doubts, whether *pratibhāti* should not rather be taken for one word. He did not mind Kathās. 24, 142 *bhāti* c. gen.: *eṣa . . . bhāty asya na vā*

<sup>1</sup>) T. II, 162 translates accordingly „married that fair-hued maid.”

'whether this man *pleases* him or not'. *Bhāti* c. gen., therefore, = *rocati* c. gen.

*mada* with the meaning 'musk' [= *mrgamada*] is registered with an asterisk in PWK (V, 12 s. v. *k*). It is met with in Kathās. t. 82, 33, but lies hidden under a corruption in Br. In D this *çloka* is edited thus: *yeyam̄ çrikhañdakarpūrakālāguru-ma do ttamaiḥ / kṛtaprasādhanā* etc.

*mahātaila* is not „kostbares Oel”, as it has been rendered in PW and PWK, but 'human fat'. See Tawney I, 306 n. and his translation of t. 73, 306 and 99, 4; cp. also *mahāmāmsa*. *māngalika*. To the one instance of meaning 2) registered in PWK, V s. v. this may be added Kathās. 115, 156. D has doubtless the right reading *Çakraḥ Çaciracita māngalikaḥ prastashe*, Br. °*māngalakah*.

*mantrika* „fehlerhaft für *māntrika*” PW and PWK s. v. Likewise Kathās. 121, 42 Br. *mantrikāḥ* is corrected in D: *māntriko diptamantra 'pi* etc.

*yuddhaka* = *yuddha* PW, VI s. v. and PWK, V s. v. must be cancelled. The sole place, where it is found, is Kathās. 49, 71 Br. King Mahāsena, while besieging some vassal (*kotṭastha*, cp. *supra*, p. 79 s. v. *koṣṭhastha*) is himself besieged by Vikramaçakti. Being thus obstructed, he says to his excellent minister Guṇaçarman:

*ekam̄ ruddhvā sthitāḥ santo ruddhāḥ smo 'nyena çatruṇā;*  
*tad idānīm aparyāptāḥ katham̄ yudhyāmahe dvayoh?*

= „While we are occupied in besieging one enemy we are besieged by another, so now how we are to fight with two enemies, as we are unequal in force?” (T I, 462) and asks this question more:

*ayuddhe yuddhake vīrāḥ sthāsyāmaç ca kiyacciram?*

What may this mean? Strictly speaking, *ayuddhe yuddhake*, even if the latter word should be = *yuddhe*, is here nonsensical, and T's translation „without fighting a battle” is very forced. But D has *ayuddhe r u d d h a k e vīrāḥ* etc., that solves the riddle. *Ruddhaka* = 'enclosure' or rather „the state of being enclosed, besieged”. Transl. „how long, being brave men, are we to be kept shut in, without fighting?”

*rathāṅganāman*. Boehltingk's correction (PW, VI s. v.) of Kathās. 104, 112 is confirmed by D. The same error of Br. against the genuine reading of D is also met with t. 55, 116.

1. *ras* PW, VI s. v. The instance quoted Kathās. 108, 106 is false. Not *rasat* (Br.) but *lasat* (D) is the right reading. The

compound in full is *raktaliptalasatkhadgalatājihvah*; the sword red with blood is compared to a tongue. Cp. T II, 455, n. 1.

*rājyatālāyita*, an *əπ. εἰρ.* registered in PW, VI s. v. as occurring Kathās. 43, 59 and repeated in PWK, represents the reading of Br. only; D has *rājño lāyitam*.

Of *riṣṭa* (n.) = 'distress, calamity', registered in PW, VI s. v. 1. *riṣṭ* 8), a certain instance is Kathās. 115, 54 D. The 4<sup>th</sup> pāda of this cloka *tanvan riṣṭam svarvāśinām iva* „preparing calamity, as if it were, to the celestials” represents doubtless the genuine text. Br.'s *tanvann iṣṭam* is a corruption thereof, T is at a loss how to explain it, see his n. 1 on II, 517. — The variance t. 116, 4 *tāny ariṣṭānī* (D), *tāny anīṣṭānī* (Br.) is more doubtful. At 119, 160 both editions have *anīṣṭācāṅkīnah*.

*ruh + ati + ā* PW, VI s. v. *Atyārūdha* „exorbitant” is the right reading Kathās. 61, 251 (D), not *anyārūdha* Br., which is void of sense in that context.

*luth + niś*. With respect to the caus. PW and PWK omit to mention the meaning ‘to demolish, to overturn [a building]’ Kathās. 76, 30 Br. and D, and 121, 180 D. In the latter place Br. has erroneously put into the text *nirlocyā tad* (T II, 580 „take this into consideration and”) instead of *nirlothya tad* ‘demolish this (temple) and [level it with the earth]’.

1. *vača* PW VI, 820. The meaning 2) „unter Jmds Befehlen stehend, unterthan, abhängig” is, among other instances, exemplified with Kathās. 81, 102. But D has *sapurāham vače tava* [not *vaçā*, as Br.] agreeably to the usual idiom.

*vidāraṇa* PW VI, 1056. The meaning sub 3) *d* „das Abweisen, Zurückweisen” instanced with Kathās. 26, 63, is based on the wrong reading of this cloka in Br. The right one is edited in D:

*tena vidyādharaṁs tāṁs tān varān uddīcato bahūn  
pitur vīdhāraṇām kṛtvā kanyaivādyāpy aham sthitā ||*

T.'s translation (I, 223) „For this reason, though my father has recommended to me many Vidyādhara suitors, I have rejected them all and remained unmarried up to this day” is accordingly in want of a slight modification. She does not say, she rejected the suitors, but she *checked* (*obstructed, stopped*) her father in his design. This is the meaning of *vidhārayati*. To the instances thereof quoted in PW, add

*A v a d ā n a ç a t a k a* I, 223, 15 *bhagavān rājamārge 'nyatamena brāhmaṇena.... vidhārita iti.* — Brockhaus must have written *vidāraṇam* by some mistake of the kind as is pointed out, *supra* p. 72.

*vidhurā* substantive = *sapatni* (Kathās. 39, 55) is not mentioned in PWK.

*viçvatra* is exemplified in PW s. v. with but two instances, one from the R̄gvedasāñhitā and one from the classic Sanskrit. This place is Kathās. 20, 187 Br., but D has *svartvatra*. An exact account of the evidence to be obtained from manuscripts is much wanted here.... but it is missing!

*vairatyā*. Boehltingk, PW s. v., understood that this *əπ. εἰσ.* in t. 60, 145 Br. is a corruption and conjectured *vairaktyam eti* 'becomes estranged.' D has *vairitvam eti*, which is doubtless the genuine reading.

*çabala*. PW s. v. establishes the meaning 1. c.) „entstellt, verändert“ and quotes several instances from the Bhāgavata purāṇa. Kathās. 54, 235 D is a new instance: *kāmamohapravṛttānām çabala dharmavāsanā* = „in the mind of those abandoned to the intoxication of love the idea of duty and religion is distorted“. Br. has *capalā* instead of *çabalā*, a bad reading which disfigures the purport of the sentence.

*çis + sam + ut*. The partic. *samucchiṣṭa* = „ritually impure“ is forgotten in PW VII s. v. 3. *çis*.

1. *çuc* causative 4) PW s. v. The meaning „reinigen“ is exemplified with one instance: Kathās. 19, 84. But D has not *açocayat* but *açodhayat* (*dūṣitam trṇatoyādi pratiyogair açodhayat*), which is preferable for this reason that *çodhayati* ‘purifies’ is conformable to *çudhyati* ‘is pure’, but not so *çocayati* with this meaning to *çocati*. For this reason, I think, Varāmihira Yogayātra 7, 14 (Ind. Studien XV, 168) *çocayet* is also to be corrected into *çodhayet*; cp. PWK s.v. *çuc*.

*çesya* PW VI, 299 „bei Seite zu lassen, fernerer Beachtung nicht werth“ is instanced with but one case: Kathās. 74, 213, where this meaning is forced. T. II, 225 translates „(to be) only worthy of neglect“, which lies still farther off. In fact, the gerundive of *çis* is not at its place in the passage quoted, and D has instead of it *svalpaḥ* = „very insignificant“. Br.’s *çesya* is certainly corrupt and must be cancelled in the Dictionary.

*saṁjivana*. The quotation Kathās. 101, 188 in PW VII s.v. 4 a) is to be put aside. Since there is no question there of

„resuscitation”, but simply of „life” opposite to „death”, D’s reading *sa jīvanapramayayoh* etc. is the right one, not Br. *samjīvana*.

*samnyāsa* with the meaning of „agreement” ‘Uebereinkunft’, PW VII, 654 s.v. 4) and PWK VII, 46 s.v. 5) does not exist at all. The sole instance of it, the quotation Kathās. 4, 36 Br. is corrupt. Instead of *kṛtasamnyāsā*, D has *kṛtasāṃdhā* *sa*; it is *samdhā*, not *samnyāsa* that means ‘Uebereinkunft’. *saptaka* n. ‘Heptad’. The quotation Kathās. 43, 13 in PW VII s.v. should rather be omitted. D has the good reading *mastaka* instead of *saptaka* (Br.) and reads accordingly the line in this manner: *viveṣa cāsyā sauvarnapuram as takaçobhināḥ / abhyantaram* etc. = „he entered within it [viz. that palace] which possessed the greatest beauty of the Golden Town.”

*sabhājayati* ‘to render homage (to)’ is instanced in PW with Kathās. 62, 8. It occurs also Kathās. 46, 25 D *tataḥ sa bhājayann anyān* etc., where Br. falsely reads *tataḥ sa bhājayann*, for the pronoun *sah* is already present in the same sentence. Likewise Br. disregarded *sabhājana* in Kathās. 45, 362 *sabhājanāya ca prāgvat Prahlādasya sabhām yayau*; he reads *sa bhojanāya* — to take his meals (T, I, 431)’ destroying thereby the meaning of that passage, as Somadeva intended to say that „he went to the hall of P. to pay his respect.”

*sampadāt* t. 45, 366 must be a false form, as Boehltingk supposed already PW, VII s.v. The Bābu Syámá Charan’s conjecture *sammadāt*, mentioned by T, I, 431 n. and recorded PWK VII, 68 is certainly right. Somadeva uses the word *sammada* (joy) oftener than should be inferred from the few quotations of it from Kathās. in PW s.v. It occurs also 19, 64 D *çaradā dattasammadāḥ* (Br. °*sampadāḥ*); 26, 287 *sammadamayim . . . daçām* (both edit.); 104, 51 D *dattasammadāḥ*, cp. T II, 414, n. 2; 108, 121, too, D has *bheje kamapi sammadam* against Br. *kāmapi sampadam*.

*sāhāyaka* quoted PW s.v. from Kathās. 17, 18 and 55, 208 is spelt in both places *sāhāyaka* in D. Yet, cp. PWK s.v.

*suhita* ‘satiated’. To the scanty instances from classical Sanskrit, quoted in PW s.v. may be added Kathās. 66, 35. Kern’s opinion (Journ. R. Asiat. Soc. l.l.) that *sukhitasya* (Br.) ought to be corrected into *suhitasya* is fully confirmed by D, where the line runs thus:

*ādhyasya kim ca dhanena suhi tasyāçanena kim.*

*Sukhita* for *suhita* is likewise written A vādānaçataka I,

189, 7, cp. the Index of my edition, s. v. At Jāt. I, 266, 14 we have an instance of *sukita* in Pāli.

*suti* 'Niederkunft' = „child-birth”. The quotation Kathās. 64, 5 must be cancelled. D reads *sūtakānte*, not *sūtikāle*, the reading of Br. The woman goes to the river to bathe at the end of the *sūtaka*, the impurity caused by child-birth, verily not at the time of her delivery (*sūtikāla*)!

*sūtrapātām kṛ* and *car* s. v. *sūtra* 2) 'Messchnur' PW and PWK. The signification could be better delineated. T I, 95 n. 3 translates 'to test', likewise I, 197, where he renders Kathās. 24, 93. 'The expression answers, indeed, almost to Latin 'periculum facere'.

*sphūrj + sam* is to be added in PW and PWK. The partic. of the present act. of this verb is met with t. 96, 12 D: *tataḥ svajanaṣaṁ sphūrja d avamānāhatātmanām* etc. Br. has *tataḥ svajanajaspaphūrjad*°.

*svarāj* Kathās. 96, 3 must be cancelled in PW s. v. The right reading is *nagarecvaraḥ* (D); *svarāj* as a simple appellative is uncommon, and, even if it were not so, it would be less proper in that context.

*svāntavant*. I think, this श्व. εἰπ. in t. 37, 25 (in both editions) is genuine (cp. the notes of D and T. I, 336 n. 1) and take it for a synonym of *svānta* = *manas* or *hrdaya*.

*hahā* 1, 'wehe!' (PW VII s.v.) Kathās. 28, 24 D *hahā* against Br. *hā hā*.

#### § 4.

The possession of a better edition affords also the advantage of getting rid of some grammatical singularities in the text of the Kathāsaritsāgara, about which formerly it was more or less uncertain how to account for. They mostly concern verbal forms and a few syntactical blunders.

D is as constant in exhibiting *abram* as Br. in the barbarism *abruvam*, cp. Kern, Journ. R. As. Soc. l.l., p. 169. D is not so correct in the case of *e* negligently put for *ai* in verbal forms from the root *i*, e. g. 37, 81, where the yakṣinī says to Niçcayadatta *aham yāmi niyām sthānam aisyāmi* [= redibo] *ca niçāgame*; both editions *esyāmi* against the obvious meaning. Likewise 43, 266. 86, 34 etc.; 62, 71 to correct *aimy aham* for the edited *emy aham*.

Tar. 16, 72 Br. has *labheyam*, but D *labheya* the middle voice,

as usual. In the same way the uncommon active of *ji + parā* t. 72, 67 Br. is not found in D; it has *vāde parājayēta i tām* (Br. *vāde parājayed etām*). Boehltingk's correction *pravīçyate* t. 45, 247 (PW VI s.v. *viç + pra*) is confirmed by D. — *Bhañjāmi* t. 62, 142 is corrupt, D has *bhajāmi*, cp. T II, 73 n. 2.

The present of *vr̥* (to choose, to adhere) according to the 5<sup>th</sup> class is met with t. 66, 109 Br. *sattvahinam na vṛṇvate c̄riyāḥ*; D *vṛṇvate* according to the 9<sup>th</sup> class. Both forms are grammatically good.

The ungrammatical aorist *āpraṣṭa* 29, 62 Br. disappears in D, whose reading *tām āprṣṭa Svayamprabhām* (a bahuvrīhi) is doubtless right. On the other hand D restores in two places the aorist of *viç* (37, 197 *upāvikṣan*; 38, 102 *prāvikṣat*), where Br. has imperfects which disturb the metre; cp. t. 42, 156.

In 1868 Kern (I.I. p. 176) had already intimated that *çraddhatuḥ* t. 103, 93 Br. is a monstrosity lectionis and should be corrected into *çraddadhuḥ*. So, indeed, is edited in D. The other monstrosity *uktavantyau* t. 124, 20 is also limited to Br.; D has *uktavatyau*. Nor is *hṛṣan* or *dhṛṣan* (t. 53, 130 Br.) found in D — the line in question is edited there as follows: *tac chrutvaiva ca so 'vādīd dhr̥ṣṭo* (rejoiced) *Viravaro dvijāḥ*. — And t. 124, 192, where Br. produces an absolute *anurajya* (sic) = 'having propitiated' (see PW. VI, 232 s.v. *raj + anu*, caus. 2), D has the right reading *anurañjya*; likewise D corrects the vicious *arajyata* t. 86, 109 of Br., it reads *tathārañjyata sā rājñā*. — Another vicious form is the infinitive *muṣitum*, t. 98, 15 Br. (not mentioned in PW), instead of it D has, of course, *moṣitum*. Kern in his paper mentioned above corrected also *yuñjatyāḥ* t. 106, 24; both editions have the faulty *yuñjantyāḥ*.

*Mamathuḥ* t. 46, 220 Br. is a legitimate various reading of *mamanthuḥ* D. Perhaps also *dr̥dhayati* 46, 10 Br. of *dradhayati* (D); in *Prabodha candrodaya* V, stanza 28 Brockhaus likewise edited *dr̥dhayati*, whereas the *Nirṇayasāgara* ed. of 1898 of that drama (p. 189, st. 22) reads *dradhayati*, also *Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara*'s ed. of 1874.

Has Somadeva used the liberty granted to epic poetry of omitting the augment? According to Br.'s edition, one would be inclined that he availed himself of that license, but sparingly. The few cases, however, of its being wanting are checked by the veto of D<sup>1)</sup>.

<sup>1)</sup> T. 43, 244 D has *abhinandata*, but here (Br.) *abhinananda* is preferable.

## Compare

Br. 50, 160 *cānurañjayat*, with D (50, 159) *cānvarañjayat*  
 „ 51, 209 *ativāhayat*, „ D *atyavāhayat*  
 „ 57, 135 *nibadhyata*, „ D *nyabadhyata*  
 „ 65, 180 *pulināny avalokayat*, „ D *pulināni vyalokayat*  
 „ 71, 51 *praveçayat*, „ D *prāveçayat*  
 „ 96, 16 *avalambayam*, „ D *udalambayam*, a preferable reading also for this reason that *ullambayaty ātmānam* — not *aval.* — is the typical expression for committing suicide by suspending one's self.

Br. 72, 39 *arcayat*, but D *ārcayat*. Nevertheless, D ordinarily agrees with Br. in the absence of the augment in the case of a verb commencing by *a* followed by two consonants. It is especially wanting in the impfts *arpayat* and *samarpayat* at the end of the 2<sup>d</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> pāda (10, 100, 205, 213; 12, 27, 172<sup>1)</sup>; 13, 101; 23, 34; 24, 165; 27, 112; 29, 161; 33, 47; 35, 47; 38, 48; 39, 201; 43, 127; 44, 25, 158; 45, 179; 46, 15; 54, 226; 61, 288; 73, 304; 74, 267; 90, 55; 102, 133; 105, 28; 117, 117; 119, 27; 121, 232, 233; 123, 102, 124, 344; 124, 121, 197) cp. *samarpyata* 70, 20; *samarpayata* 72, 54. Of the kind are also *açnāt* 42, 68; *udasayatu*, 121, 52; D has also *abhyasyat* 43, 274, but here Br. *abhyasyan* (participle) seems to me the better reading. At t. 118, 81 D reads *ardayan Mala-yadvajah* against Br. *ārdayad*.

Somadeva, therefore, seems, to have altogether abstained from imperfects and aorists without augment (the aor. with *mā*, of course, excluded), save this case of *a* + two consonants. In this respect he contrasts with his rival Kṣemendra, who — if we may trust the printed text — admitted of imperfects without augment rather freely, e. g. Brhkm. p. 254, 476. p. 413, 21. p. 451, 11. p. 453, 36. p. 456, 76.

At t. 101, 91 it is D that has the incorrect passive *gūhyate*, the right from *guhyate* is in Br.

Several times there is variance in the two editions in such cases, where both forms are good. Br. has *kṣayita* 21, 28, 22, 202, 64, 161, 77, 36; D everywhere *kṣapita*. The same applies, it seems, to such orthographies as *dākinī* — *dāginī*; *koçilikā* (D) — *kauçilikā*; *peṭā* — *pedā*; *chāgalā* — *chagala*; *kutṭanī* — *kuttinī*; *picchila* — *picchala*; *bahula* — *bahala*; *kṣurikā* — *churikā*; *dhattūraka* — *dhustūraka*; *prāghunika* — *prāhunika*; *tītibha* — *tītibha*; *peyūṣa* — *piyūṣa*.

<sup>1)</sup> But t. 12, 64 D has *samarpayat* against Br. *samarpayat*.

In part of them one of the forms is nearer to the original Paiçācī.

From a syntactical point of view it may be observed that D now and then restores *enam* and the like in such cases as where *etam* etc. found in Br. are less correct or inversely, e. g. 42, 177 D *so 'py enam* [Br. *etam*] *agrahit*, but 45, 368 D *Sumundikam caitam* [Br. *ca 'enam*]. At. t. 49, 183 D and 50, 195 D both editions have wrongly *etam* for *enam*.

Tar. 118, 100 Br. *yūyam prayātam Pātālam* „do you march to Pātāla!“; D reads *yuvām prayātam*. The connection of the plural of the pronoun-subject with the dual of the imperative-predicate is apparently due to some oversight of Br. The same must be said of 20, 152 *na 'evam vādih* Br., in D we find *maivam vādih*, as must be expected a priori and cp. the similar passage 103, 47. Nor can I anyhow believe that Br. found in his manuscripts that which is edited 42, 58 *dārābhyaṁ* for *dārebhyo* (D), such a dual being unheard of.

The rare instance of an accusativus cum infinitivo t. 20, 172 Br. *çrāntah kamapi rājānam snātuṁ tatra dadarça ca*, which I have quoted in my *Sanskrit Syntax* p. 307, n. 3, falls away; D reads *snāntam*, the participle wanted here!

The 1 pers. of the imperative *kathām pibāni* t. 61, 238 Br., though good in itself, had become uncommon in Somadeva's days. It is not met with in D, which has *kathām pibāmi*. Here and in the preceding case it is impossible to guess, how far Br. went in his modification of the text he found in his manuscripts.

Tar. 45, 400 Br. contains a modus irrealis expressed by a conditional in the apodosis and an aorist(!) in the protasis, as follows: *bhasmākariṣyad uṣmatkrodhāgnis tvām agham vyadhaś tac cet* = „The fire of my wrath would have reduced thee to ashes, if thou hadst committed that sin“. Yet it is not Somadeva, but Br. who is liable to that syntactical sin; D reads — and manifestly, he is right — *aghām vyadhaśyac cet*.

Here are some other cases of syntactical irregularities put away:

1. In t. 84, the tenth Vētālā-tale, cl. 44 relates that „a certain thief saw Madanasenā, . . . and rushing upon her, seized her by the hem of her garment“ (T. II, 280). The words I have italicized render Br.'s *kenāpi rurudhe vasanāñcalāt*. Instead of that abl., which is hard to be accounted for, D has the locative *vasanāñcale* conformably to the use, cp. my *Sanskrit Syntax* § 139 d. — 2. The structure of the sentence t. 58, 41 Br. *prāg eva mama nādiṣṭam kim deve-nādhunāpi tat* is clumsy; in D its elegance is restored, since *yat* takes the place of *tat*. — 3. The singular *vartate* and the inter-

punction in t. 118, 121 impair the meaning of the context apud Br., who erroneously joins *vartate* with *prāptakālah*; this word is an adjective qualifying *dārasamgrahaḥ*. This is plain in D:

*vijitāḥ ḡatravāḥ, putra, yuvānau bhrātarau yuvām,*  
*svādhinā rājakanyāç ca, mayā tāç ca gaveṣitāḥ*  
*vartante, prāptakālas tat kriyataṁ dārasamgrahaḥ.* —

4. The use of a dual of the neuter gender *pavitrītē*, t. 123, 185 Br., to express the common predicate of the two subjects *purāṇam Pāṭaliputram* and *Deçatāḥ pītā* is singular, and D's reading *pavitrītas. tad āyāhi* etc. must be considered the right one. Cp. t. 121, 218. — 5. The interpunction of t. 105, 37, as edited in Br., is proper to lead astray the reader: *yathā yathā vicinvāno, na tāṁ prāpa tathā tathā*. I, at least, troubled myself to account for that partic. of the present *vicinvānah* with the function of a verb finite, but afterwards, when I read the same passage over in the non-interpunged edition of D, it was immediately clear to me, that Br. ought to have interpunged *yathā yathā vicinvāno na tam prāpa, tathā tathā / teṣu teṣu pradeṣeṣu . . . so 'bhramat*. Verily, it is better to edit Sanskrit texts with *nāgarī* types and little interpunction than in transcription and with Occidental fulness of stops, semi-colons, signs of exclamation and interrogation, etc. These signs are better dispensed with.

### § 5.

Durgaprasād and his collaborator were better Sanskritists than Brockhaus; they availed themselves of his *editio princeps*; moreover they had the good chance of having in their possession an excellent manuscript not known to their predecessor. So they could carry out an edition of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, in many respects superior to that of the European scholar. I have stated above that nevertheless their work cannot be called a critical edition, nor has it the pretension of making this claim. Inaccuracies and bad readings are not wanting in that better text, too. Now and then, Br.'s text is even preferable. This is chiefly the consequence of typographical errors and misprintings, easily recognizable as such and less adapted to misleading than the errors and mistakes of Br. Another drawback for Hindoo editors is the right division of the words according to the standard of European and American use, something unfamiliar to minds accustomed to the *scriptio continua*. Errors in this respect are not wanting neither, but they are easy to be detected. The first edition of D contained a *çuddhapattram*

with a great number of corrections, yet not complete; this list is not added to the 2<sup>d</sup> edition — my copy is from 1903 — but the editors have, of course, corrected their text accordingly. The accuracy in revising it was, however, not so great as to forbid new typographical errors to make their appearance: e. g. 42, 172 *jagāma* D<sup>1</sup> and Br., *jagāda* (quite nonsensically) D<sup>2</sup>; — 45, 398 *na ca tasyecca vitathā* D<sup>1</sup> and Br., *na ca tasyeccañmi tathā* (sic) D<sup>2</sup>; — 54, 32 *udbhūtā* D<sup>1</sup> and Br., *tadbhūtā* D<sup>2</sup>; — 64, 101 *pānamattā* D<sup>1</sup> and Br., *pānavattā* (nonsense) D<sup>2</sup>. Upon the whole the amount of such inaccuracies and misprints is not too great for a text edited in India by Indian scholars, and such cases as 62, 72 *kṛtyādhaḥ*, 71, 255 *vigayogārṇavottirṇau* instead of *kṛtvādhaḥ* and *viprayogārṇavottirṇau*, where the oversight of the error of the typographer who put one wrong akṣara for the right one, destroys the understanding of the whole sentence, are comparatively rare<sup>1)</sup>.

Another face of the shortcomings of the learned pandits, measured by the standard applied to Western scholarship, however laudable their work may be from a vernacular point of view, shows itself in the following. The editors have taken Br.'s text for the base of their edition. This was the most natural course to be followed; even if they had not explicitly named Br. together with the two manuscripts as the three *pustakāni* which were the sources of their text, we would consider it a matter of course that they made the „editio princeps“ the groundwork of their own performances. I suppose, they will have marked their corrections and modifications in some copy of Br. Yet in doing this useful work they could have been a little more careful. Now and then it is likely some faults of Br. have passed over in their edition, by want of accuracy, not because the same faults are in their manuscripts. In the beginning of t. 71 Mṛgāṅkadatta rescues a Çabara king from drowning in the river. The grateful prince offers him his friendship and assistance, and invites him as his guest:

*tat prasādam kuruvaihi gr̥hān bhṛtyasya te prabho*

„So do me the favour, my lord, of coming to my palace, since I am your slave“ (T. II, 154). It is clear, that *bhṛtyasya te* must be read. Both editions, however, have *bhṛtyasya me*. The mistake of Br. remained unchanged by inadvertence of D. Other instances are: 21, 96 Br. and D *bheje 'parām ḡriyam*, though it is evident that *bheje parām ḡriyam* is meant; 73, 396 *baddhvā* Br. and D.

<sup>1)</sup> Cp. also 105, 8 D *paradāragṛhāṇi* a nonsensical reading for °*grahāṇi*. Tar. 34, 96 Br. *tāṇi* is doubtless preferable to D *sā*.

for *vadhvā* cp. T II 212 „with his wife”; 25, 216 *taṣmānnīci* for *tasyām niṣi*; 63, 175 foll. *prakṛta* for *prākṛta*. In this respect, the 2<sup>d</sup> edition is somewhat better: 31, 1 D<sup>1</sup> with B has the ungrammatical participle *kurvanti*, D<sup>2</sup> *kurvatī*; 48, 5 D<sup>1</sup> with B the barbarism *bhidanti*, D<sup>2</sup> *bhindanti*.

It would be useless to deal longer or fuller with this subject. Even if I succeeded in drawing a complete list of all those cases where D's readings are inferior to those of Br., the profit would be small. Taking all in all, D is the standard edition nowadays and ought to keep this worth up to that future time, when the text of the Kathāsaritsāgara, critically revised in the strict sense of the word, and with help of all manuscripts available duly selected and classified, will lay before us.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### LIST OF PASSAGES, THE TEXT OF WHICH HAS BEEN IMPROVED IN D.

After expounding in the preceding chapter the progress obtained for the understanding of our text by the edition of D, we will now proceed to make up a list of the more important cases of improved readings, not yet mentioned in the foregoing. Sometimes the meaning of the text is greatly modified by them, sometimes the bearing of the change is less, but I have avoided from noticing such corrections — and they, too, are numerous — as are of no consequence for the understanding.

- 1, 42 D *tacca tatsamcayāyaiva* with a meaning more appropriate than that of the text of Br.; also the metre is improved. Cp. T I, 3 n.
- 61 D *mokṣyate*, the 3<sup>d</sup> person is indispensable, as Çarvāṇī does not address Mālyavant; Br. *mokṣyase* will not do here.
- 5, 11 D *pañcabhir militaiḥ kīm ya j jagatiḥ na sādhyate*, doubtless right, *kīm na* being, as usual, = *sarvam api*; Br. *kīyat*.
- 133 D *çūkāçinam* ‘eater of vegetables’, instead of Br. *çākāsanam*, unmeaning. T already detected the fault, cp. his translation I, 31, n. 2.
- 6, 20 D *gaṇāvatāro jāto 'yam Guṇādhyāḥ*, where Br. *guṇāvatāro* etc.; hence T translates „this child is an incarnation of virtue”, what ought to be „an incarnation of one of his Gaṇas.” Another instance of confounding *guṇa* and *ganya* is at 45, 368. In D the similar mistake has been made 114, 70; Br. has here the right reading.
- 32 In the pleasant story of the merchant Müṣaka it is related that he was born after his father’s death and that this mother, having lost her property by the wickedness of his relations, educated him in poverty. From lack of

money to pay a teacher, she persuades some teacher to give him some instruction by way of charity. Here B.'s reading (which has also passed into Lanman's *Reader* p. 40): *upādhyāyam athābhyaṛthya tayā kiṁcana dīnayā* is not satisfactory; what may here be the use of *kiṁcana*? The good reading is of course (D) *tayā kiṁcanyā dīnayā*, 'she, deserving compassion because of her poverty (*ākiṁcanya*)'.

- 86 Instead of Br. *ity evam uddeṣe*, which T could not render properly, D has *ity evam taddēṣe*.
- 150 T translates well: „and the king for his part was comforted”, but this is not expressed by Br.'s *çastah*, but by the text as constituted in D *rājāpy ubhayataḥ siddhim matvāçvas to babbūva sah*.
- In other passages, too, Br. has failed with respect to the verb *çvas*: 25, 201 D and T *samāçvāsyā* (Br. *samāçvāsyā*); 33, 173 D *viçvāsyā* (Br. wrongly *viçvāsyā*); 106, 100 D and T *kṛtāçvāsā* (B *kṛtā 'áçā*).
- 7, 5 Caravarman narrates to his king his journey to Kārttikeya's shrine in order to obtain the help of that god to fulfil his extraordinary promise. When, *being near his aim*, he fell senseless on the ground, exhausted by austerities and fatigue, some affable man, so he said, had comforted him and taken away his hunger and thirst. The words I have put in italics are so corrupt in the original text of Br., that T could not find out their meaning. D gives them in their genuine shape, editing *tato 'dhvani manākcheṣe jāte* 'when there was (still) little remaining of the way'.
- 79 It must not be read with Br. *putro me presitah kvāpi* (T „my son has been sent away somewhere”), but with D *prosītah* ‘my son is abroad somewhere’.
- 84 D *samutsārya* preferable to Br. *samutpātya*.
- 10, 12 Crī gratifies her worshipper Kālanemi with the promise that he shall become wealthy and obtain a son who shall rule a kingdom, yet himself shall be put to death in an ignominious manner, „because thou hast offered flesh in the fire with impure motives.” T has translated so from Br. *hutam agnau trayā yasmād amiṣam kaluṣātmanā*. The offering of flesh looks somewhat strange in this place, as the preceding çlokas mention only libations (*homās*) offered to the goddess of Fortune. The right reading is

found in D *yaemād amarṣa kaluṣātmanā* ‘because thou hast offered libations with a mind troubled by anger.’

47 D *jīgāya* suits better the structure of the period than Br. *jītyā ca*.

11, 6 Br.’s reading *ekā Vāsavadattākhyā kanyā kāmayate param* (T „the maiden named V. alone has a liking for me”) purports an impossibility. At this point of the tale Udayana, who speaks these words, either did not know Vāsavadattā at all or only by name. Moreover, the tale itself makes her fall in love with U. a long time thereafter and in consequence of a contrivance of U. The right reading is in D: *ekā Vāsavadattākhyā kanyākāçrūyate param* etc. = „there is but one maiden, they say (that suits me as a wife)”.

52 What may be the meaning of the last word of the line *sā tam praty abravid evam manmathājñānuvandinī* (Br.)? Since there must be expressed by that phrase that Āṅgāravatī spoke so, moved by love towards Candamahāsena, D’s reading *manmathājñānuvar tini* is of course, to be adopted.

12, 49 ff. Yaugandharāyaṇa associates himself with the brahmaṛāksasa Yogeṣvara, who ‘chose him’ as his friend, as is rightly said in D *mitrabhāvāya . . . vṛtavān abhyetya*, whereas B, confounding the akṣaras *dh* and *v* — see *supra*, p. 70 — has *dṛtavān upetya*. Thanks to a charm taught to him by that friend, Y. altered his shape changing himself into a deformed, hunchbacked old man with the appearance of a madman; *unmattaveṣah* in Br. must be of course *°veṣah*<sup>1)</sup>; the words that follow in Br. *khalv attahāsyasamjananah* (cl. 51) cannot be genuine, for *attahāsyā* does not simply mean ‘laughter’ and is wholly out of place here. From D it appears that he was bald, too, *khalvāto hāsyasamjananah*. In cl. 52 D has *sirānaddhapr̥thidaram* for B’s *çirānaddham pr̥*.

64 D *vinātantrinijoyitān . . . rājñe 'smai sa samarpayat*: Br. has here *°yocitān* (typographical error?) and *'smai samam arpayat*.

14, 46 In the tale of the clever deformed child this boy says to his father: „‘Papa, I have two papas’. So the boy said every day, and his father suspecting that his wife

<sup>1)</sup> *veṣa* is the ordinary orthography of this word in Br.

had a paramour, would not even touch her." This the child spoke „with suppressed voice”, as Tawney translates Br.'s *ardhāviṣṭayā girā* = 'mit leiser Stimme' in his German translation. This suppressed voice, though not contrary to the situation, can never be meant by the quoted words of the text; *ardhāviṣṭa* signifies 'occupied —, possessed for the half'. D has the appropriate expression *avispaṣṭayā girā*, 'with his inarticulate voice', as he was a little child.

- 15, 57      D *bhavema vyabhicāriṇah*, preferable to Br. *bhavet sā vyabhicāriṇī*.
- 16, 46      D *avasaram daduh* more in conformity with the idiom than Br... *dadhuḥ*.
- 91      According to Br., Vāsavadattā accompanied the army incognito „ascending a comfortable carriage sent by Padmāvatī, with its great horses also put at her disposal by her (T).” As she is said to have got a carriage, it was not necessary to add that she obtained it with its horses. Somadeva, indeed, does not narrate so; instead of *tanmahāturaṇaiḥ* (Br.) we find in D *tanmaḥattarakaiḥ*, attendants of rank and high personages were put at her disposal, besides the carriage.
- 121      When the celestial voice has testified with roaring sound to the innocence of Vāsavadattā, all bystanders are astonished and rejoiced like peacocks hearing the pleasant sound of thunder. In this likeness the epithet *udyatkarāḥ* 'with uplifted hands' of Br. is less appropriate than D's reading *utkandharāç ca suciram* etc., for uplifting the neck towards the celestial apparition does apply as well to the king's attendance as to the peacocks.
- 17, 19      In the myth of Purūravas and Urvaçī it is told how Indra after vanquishing the demons made a great feast. This *utsavah* is characterized in Br. by the epithet *pravṛttasarvavadvūśarthah* (T. „a feast, at which all the nymphs of the heaven displayed their skill”, Geldner *Ved. Studien I*, 257 „ein Fest, an welchem die Himmelsmädchen theilnahmen”). Better D *pranṛta°* 'where the Apsarasas executed their dances'. Cp. *supra*, p. 70.
- 32      King Udayana by his narration of the adventures of Urvaçī had abashed a little his wife Vāsavadattā suspecting a disguised reproof of her own conduct. Yaugandharāyaṇa, in order to dispel that thought from her

mind and to appease her, begins to narrate some other story about a wife who loved her husband most sincerely. This is said in clear and plain words in D:

*tām dr̥ṣtvā yuktyupālabdhām rājñā devīm vilakṣitām  
at hāpy āya yitum bhūpam āha Yaugandharāyaṇāḥ ||*

Br. has here *tathā 'apy īpayitum*, which cannot mean ‘to make him feel in his turn’ [T] („um ihn auch etwas empfinden zu lassen” Brockhaus’ own transl.) and is obviously nonsensical.

**73 foll.** The merchant Dharmagupta, knowing that his daughter Somaprabhā must not be given in marriage, concealed her; yet a young merchant, Guhacandra beheld her on the occasion of the spring-festival and no sooner had he got sight of her, than *sa manobhavavallyeva sadyo hr̥dayalagnayā / tayā munīrccheva* (Br.), which in T’s translation is rendered: „she clung like a creeper of love round his heart, so that he was, as it were, faint”. This singular image we happily get rid of, finding in D’s text that he fainted because his heart was hit, as it were, *manobhava bhalliyeva*, that is ‘by Amor’s arrow’.

The enamoured youth having informed his parents of his love by the mouth of a friend, his father Guhasena went to Dharmagupta to ask his daughter in marriage for his son. This demand is followed by a refusal, but the pretext of madness of the girl, which Dh. gives in Br.’s text, cl. 76, *kanyā 'arthato me mūḍhā 'iti* (T „the fact is, my daughter is out of her mind”) is not sufficiently in accordance with the rest of the tale. In D the father answers *kanyā ku to me mūḍheti [= mūḍha + iti]* „I have no daughter at all, fool!” In fact, Dh., after the birth of that extraordinary and heavenly being, had given out abroad that she was dead (*mṛteti khyāpitam bakiḥ* cl. 70).

**128** Afterwards, Somaprabhā having become Guhacandra’s wife on condition that she never should share his bed, the husband endeavours to excite her love by degrees, in order that he may enjoy the pleasure of a conjugal life. He feigns to prepare himself to call upon a certain hetaera and so rouses her jealousy. Looking at him askance with wrinkled brows she says:

*hum jñātam etadartha 'yam vesas; tatra ca mā sma gāḥ!  
kim tayā? mām upehi tvam; aham hi tava gehini.*

According to Br., she speaks these words *vidārya vāmena kareṇa*, a phrase I cannot understand; its translation ('zog ihn an der linken Hand herbei', T 'lifting up her veil with her left hand') is effected by hermeneutical *tours de force*. D restores the genuine text reading *nivārya* etc. 'retaining him with her left hand'.

133 A small mistake disfigures the *morale de la fable* as exposed by the great Yaugandharāyaṇa. Instead of *yoga*° there is to be read with D *yāga pradānādisukṛtaḥ cūbhakarmanām . . . tishtanti grhiṇipade*. There is here no room for *yoga*, but the good works, the reward of which are such excellent heavenly wives, consist of *sacrifices*, acts of charity and the like.

18, 24 In Br. the splendid beauty of the royal palace is compared to that of the sea at moonrise or of a lotuspond *pravāte* („in windy weather“ T). D has *prabhāte* ‘at daybreak’, and this Somadeva surely must have meant.

46 foll. In the description of the golden throne dug up for Udayana by the peasants, which is a foretoken of his future domination, there are three errors in Br., one of which has been corrected by T (*darçayat* for °*yan*), another by Boehltingk (*mati* for *sati*, see Petr. Dict. VII, 569 s. v. *sati*). Both corrections make part of D's text; moreover the first compound is there *arunamani grāv akirāṇaprasaraiḥ*, Br.° *grāma*°.

53 King Udayana exhorted by his first minister to seat himself on the golden throne, with these words: *etat kulakramāyātām mahāsimhāsanām tvayā / yat prāptām tat samāruhya devālamkriyatām iti*, declines on account that such a high place behoves only one who has performed the *digvijaya*. The king's answer is made up of the cl. 53 and 54. Yet the former of them has such a shape in Br., that the translator must add the former line to Yaugandharāyaṇa's speech and assign only the second part of the cloka to the king. Br. reads:

*vijitya prthvīm ārūḍhā yatra te prapitāmahāḥ  
tatra jitvā diçāḥ sarvāḥ kāmam ārohataḥ prathāḥ.*

In D, however, the cloka has this fashion:

, *vijitya prthvīm ārūḍhā yatra me prapitāmahāḥ  
ta trājītvā diçāḥ sarvāḥ kāmam ārohataḥ prathā*  
= „That throne which my ancestors mounted after conquering the earth, how can I gain glory by ascending

it before conquering all the regions? etc. Thus speaking (*ity ūcivān narapatir*) and so on”.

88 Adityasena mounts on horseback; his horse is an excellent runner „that in spirit and fury resembled a torrent” <sup>1)</sup>, as T translates (Br.) *varāçvam̄ darpodghaṭananirjharam*. This somewhat surprising image, where also *udghaṭana* itself is employed in a strange manner, to say nothing more, disappears in D. The horse is simply described there as *darpoḍyad gharmanirjharam* <sup>2)</sup>, that is literally „sweating [gharmanirjhara = *sveda*] from (ardour and) pride”.

136 This çloka is a variation on the *οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιράνην*. Br.’s text disagrees here in two points with D; it has in pāda b *buddhi*, but D *vrddhi*, and in pāda d two words *vibhinnam bahunāyakam* that make up a compound in D. The reading of the latter is:

*varam̄ hi daivāyattaiakovṛddhi sthānam anāyakam  
na tu viplutasarvārthan̄ vibhinnabahunāyakam*

„better, indeed, is a state without a ruler so that their prosperity merely depends on Fate, than one with many discordant rulers, which entails the scattering of all their wealth”. Surely, this is a sentence more suitable to the situation.

145 Vidūṣaka has obtained the promise of the brahmans, his cohabitants, that they should recognise him as their chief and lord after he would have well performed a certain difficult enterprise. ‘If you do this’, so they speak in T’s translation, ‘you shall be our lord, we make this agreement.’ This translation expresses their declaration otherwise than the text, which it is supposed to render. They did not say „we make this agreement” but „we consider ourselves bound by this word”, *evaṁ kṛte tvam̄ asmākam̄ svāmī niyama eṣa naḥ* (cl. 144). By itself the difference is extremely slight, but it seemed worth noticing to me because in the next çloka a word for ‘agreement’ being wanted, Br. has *niyama* that may be = ‘obligation, bond’ but can never mean ‘agreement’ commonly expressed by *samaya*. The whole çloka in Br. runs as follows:

*ity eva khyāpya niyamam̄ prāptāyām̄ rajanau ca tān  
āmantrya vīprān prayayau cmaçānam̄ sa Vidūṣakah̄.*

<sup>1)</sup> T I, 129 adds this note: ‘More literally, a torrent of pride and kicking.’

<sup>2)</sup> In D <sup>o</sup> “yaddharma<sup>o</sup>, a hypothetical error.

In it, besides *niyamam*, the absolute *khyāpya* is grammatically incorrect. D again removes the difficulties, reading *ityevā khyāpya samayam* etc.; cp. 142 *samaye ca vayam sthitāh* and 139 *samayam vo dadāmy aham*.

- 267 Princess Duhkhalabdhikā had been given in marriage to the king of Kacchapa, but as the husband entered at night the private apartments of his newly married wife he died immediately. The same disaster occurred anew at her second wedlock, „and when through fear of the same fate other kings did not wish to marry her, the king gave this order to his general — ‘You must bring a man in turn from every single house in the country so that one shall be supplied every day, and he must be a Brāhmaṇ or a Kshatriya. And after you have brought the man, you must cause him to enter by night into the apartment of my daughter; let us see how many will perish in this way, and how long it will go on. Whoever escapes shall afterwards become her husband’. The last sentence is T’s (I, 138) translation of cl. 267 a, as edited in Br.:

*yas tarisyati paṭṭāc ca so 'syā bhartā bhavisyati,*  
here *paṭṭāt* (afterwards) is superfluous with the future *bhavisyati*. In D the line reads much better thus:

*uttarisyati ya c cātra so 'syā bhartā bhavisyati*  
‘who survives in this (trial) shall become her husband.’

- 280 Vidūṣaka offers himself to that dangerous adventure. While he was staying in the apartment of the princess, he saw the Rākṣasa, that caused the death of the former bridegrooms who had perished there, opening the door and stretching his hand through the entrance into the room. So according to D *apāvṛta kapāṭakam . . . ḥyāntam . . . aikṣata*. The reading of Br. *apāvṛttakavāṭakam* is evidently a corruption thereof.

- 374 Br. *kāṣṭāgatam snehāt*, T (I, 143) renders this thus: „to him who though affection had endured the utmost”, hesitating, as it were, between accepting *kāṣṭā*° or *kāṣṭhā*° as the necessary correction of the unmeaning *kāṣṭā*°. From D it appears that the genuine reading is *kāṣṭhāgatā snehāt*, a compound regarding not the love of Vidūṣaka but of Bhadrā. „At hearing this, her affection came to its highest pitch.” Cp. Kumārasambhava 3, 35.

19, 64 For *dattasampadah* (Br.), a doubtless corruption, D

- has *dattasammadah* ‘much rejoiced’, a better reading than that mentioned by T, *°sambhavah*. At 104, 51 Br. has the same fault; here, too, D and two of T’s MSS read *°sammadah*. As to *sammada*, cp. 26, 287. 46, 366.
- 70 This çloka describes the impression made on the mind of the spectators by the march of the victorious army of Udayana by means of the simile that the clouds of dust raised by it „concealed the brightness of the sun.” This is rightly said in D *itiva taccamūrenur arkatejas tirodadhe*. Br.’s text *itva tac ca bhūrenuh* etc. (sic) is unmeaning.
- 96      *na param Muralānām sa sehe mūrdhasu nonnatim  
karair āhanyamānesu yāvat kāntāku ceṣv api.*  
So D. In Br. *kāntā* being severed from *kuceṣu* is considered a word by itself, which caused T to misunderstand the meaning of the whole phrase<sup>1)</sup>. There is no mention at all of tributes (*kara*) or other exaction by which the Muralas „were completely beaten down”, but of their womankind. ‘Not only’, says the poet, ‘he did not allow the Muralas to keep their heads high, he abated also the elevation of their women’s breasts beaten down by their own hands (in mourning over their killed relatives’).
- 107 When Udayana set out to conquer the Northern region, he marched, says Somadeva, to the quarter made lovely by the smile of Kubera: *Kailāsaḥasubhagām āçām abhisasūra sal*. In Br.’s text this line is preceded by the words *Kuberatilakām Alakām aṅgaçāmsinīm*, manifestly epithets of the Northern quarter. Yet Alakā is Kubera’s city, it is not synonymous with Kubera’s quarter, and how to explain *aṅgaçāmsinīm*? D substituting one akṣara (*sa* for *ma*) dispels this perplexity. It has: *tatah Kuberatilakām Alakāsaṅgaçāmsinīm* etc.
- 20, 137 The terrible aspect of the witch Kālarātrī is qualified by several epithets, among them *nayanānanavātolkā*. From D we learn that is should be *°vāntolkā* „casting forth flames out of her eyes and mouth”.
- 219 Yaugandharāyaṇa applying to king Brahmadatta the story he has told says to Udayana:
- tasmāt tava sa rājendra jitvāpy ācaratah çubham  
Brahmadatto vikurvita yadi, hanyās tvam eva tam.*
- So D. The apodosis in Br. is *hanyeta sa ’eva tat* (sic).

<sup>1)</sup> Brockhaus himself tacitly omitted the difficult line in his translation.

- 21, 60** The merchant Vasudatta bestowed so much wealth on his son-in-law, a king's son, that his pride on account of his father's splendour vanished. This is the meaning of the çloka as found in D, whose second line is  
*ag ala d bahumāno 'sya yathā svapitṛvaibhave,*  
 evidently preferable to B *acalad* etc.
- 140** „Nārada said that you should obtain a son by propitiating Çiva” (T I, 172). This is the purport of the line in Br.  
*Giriçāradhanam prāpyaputram te Nārado 'bhyadhāt.*  
 Here the reader tacitly corrects *Giriçāradhanaprāpyam putram*, and this is found indeed in D.
- 22, 38** Jīmūtavāhana, having got the permission of his father Jīmūtaketu, besought his wishing-tree to display its wonderful power only to the benefit of others, in order that poverty should cease to be in the world. Accordingly „the wishing-tree . . . showered much gold on the earth, and all the people rejoiced (T)”. The glory of that fact and the attachment of the people to Jīmūtavāhana and his father filled the kinsmen of that prince with envy and hatred. They became hostile to Jīmūtaketu, „they thought it would be easy to conquer that place, which possessed the excellent wishing-tree that was employed for bestowing gifts, on account of its not being strong (T).” If I rightly understand, the last clause must mean that they held the seat of the royal power for having lost its strength, since the wishing-tree instead of serving as an instrument for upholding the reigning dynasty had been assigned to different aims. But if Somadeva intended to say so, why should he not state it explicitly? He is not accustomed to an obscure style. The fact is that Br.'s text, which T had to follow, has here a reading hard to explain; for what may be the meaning of *yuktāspadam* in *dānopayuktasatkalpavrksayuktāspadam*? D has *mukta* instead of *yukta*. So the purport of the whole çloka

*dānopayuktasatkalpavrksam u k tā spadam ca tat*

*menire niśprabhāvatvāj jetumi sukaram eva ca*

becomes plain. ‘They thought it would be easy to conquer that (kingdom, *rājyam* in cl. 37), as it had lost its strength on account of the *change of place* of the excellent wishing-tree now employed to bestowing gifts’. In cl. 34 it has been narrated that the wishing-tree, at Jīmūtav.’s request,

showered gold on the earth. In order to produce this effect it is necessary that the *kalpavrikṣa* must have lifted up itself before from the earth into heaven. That this, in fact, is presupposed by the narrator of our tale, is fully demonstrated by comparing the other redaction of the story of Jimūtavāhana in the Kathāsaritsāgara, where that withdrawal to the celestial sphere is expressly stated, tar. 90, 27 foll.

- 135 Instead of *bhavan*, which from a grammatical point of view is unimpeachable, but is not admissible, since it is not idiomatic to use *bhavan* for *san* = श्व, D has *naman*. T's translation (I, 179 i. f.) is accordingly to be corrected thus: „But he, assuming heavenly garments and ornaments, <bowed to me and> thus addressed me.”
- 206 Br. *Pātāle tu praveṣṭavyam na twayā mandakariṇā*, in T's translation: „But you must not act so foolishly as to enter Pātāla.” Better than *mandakariṇā*, that necessitates a somewhat forced interpretation to make something not too absurd out of it, is D's reading *mardākariṇā*. ‘You must not enter Pātāla, pursuing your work of destruction’, so Vāsuki said to Garuḍa. Somadeva uses *mardu* = *mardana* also 101, 362 and 108, 193.
- 23, 50 I think we do better to assume with D that Simha-parākrama made his repudiated wife a *grāsaikabhāgīnī* whom he accorded her livelihood and nothing more, than that she became a *grāmaika*<sup>°</sup> (Br.), in T's translation „after assigning to that Kalahakārī one village only as her portion.” Cp. the punishment inflicted by Cāṇakya on the two wicked high officials in Mudrārākṣasa Act III (p. 135 ed. Bombay)<sup>1</sup>.
- 24, 22 In Br.'s text the sentence cannot be construed, because there is no verb. D has the genuine reading *pitrā Kanakarekheti mātrnāmnā kṛtātmajā* (Br. *nrpātmaja*)<sup>2</sup>.
- 100—104 In the humorous relation of the pious conduct of the hypocrite devotee Čiva D improves Br.'s text unquestionably in three places. At 100 b, where Br. has *trisandhyām*, a doubtful word both from a grammatical point of view and from that of the context, D reads: *bhikṣātrayam tataḥ]... cakre triḥ satyam iva khaṇḍaçaḥ*

<sup>1)</sup> *tau...mayā līlakārābhīyām acaropya svajivanamātreṇaiva sthāpitau.*

<sup>2)</sup> Cp. 26, 174 Br. (= 176 D), another instance of perverted construction. D again has the intact shape of the sentence: *kṣanād a paçyat sā vāsam udvānagahanāṇī mahat.*

'he divided the begged food, three handfuls of rice, into three parts, just as he broke asunder the truth'. Cl. 102 has in D this shape:

*punaḥ sa sarvapāpāni nijāni gaṇayann iva  
japann āvartayāmāsa cirāṇi mithyākṣamālikām.*

And 104c D has *sa ta trāvarjayāmāsa* (Br. *sarvatrāv°*).

- 25, 13 D has *taśmin snānādi kṛtvā* (not *tasmāt*, as Br.) a manifest correction.

- 140 Line b of this çloka is not only defective in Br., but is also depraved by a false reading which obscures the meaning. T's translation (I, 211) „like the night adorned with the rays of the moon, now that the moon itself had set, its splendour having waned in the dark fortnight, come to worship the funeral pyre”, rests on Br.'s *citārcāya*. In D all is plain, for instead of *citārcāya* ('to worship the fun. pyre!') it has *citārohāya*. The wife who sits down on the earth near her empaaled husband is duly compared to a night of the dark half of the month, at the time when the moon has set; both, in fact, are preparing to ascend the pyre that is to consume their husband, the woman after the death of the tortured man and Night in the glow of the approaching dawn:

*kṛṣṇapakṣaparikṣine gate 'stāṇi rajinīpatau  
citārohāya tadraçmiramyām rātrim ivāgatām.*

- 169 „Let him therefore” says the queen in T's translation (I, 213), „be united to him, as a spring-creeper to its stalk.” The image is bad, and contrary to the use of Indian rhetoric, that always compares the union of husband and wife to the creeper clinging to a tree. In fact, D has here, as must be expected, *vṛkṣeṇevārtavī latā*, not *vṛnten°*, as in Br.

- 183 D *vikriṇāno mahāmāṇsam gr̥hyatām iti ghoṣayan*, evidently the right reading, Br. has *vikriṇite*; the present tense disturbs the structure of the phrase.

- 204 and 211 On both places the pronoun of the 2<sup>d</sup> person has been ousted in Br. by a false reading. D has in the former place *ākarṣanāya bhūyas te*, where the personal pronoun is indispensable, whereas Br.° *bhūyas tam* with an unnecessary demonstrative. In the latter one D reads *eka-tva-nnūparaspardhidvityānayanam mayā*.

- 238 The absolute locative, that describes the dreadfulness of

the evening-twilight, when the rākṣasas are roaming about, has in D this shape different from Br.:

*sphuraddīpāvalid a n t amālā b hā s v arabhiṣane  
jṛmbhamāne mahāraudre ni cānaktamcarimukhe.*

Br., reading in pāda a *avalīdha* etc. failed to realize that here is meant the tooth-like row of flame-lines which diffuses some light in the fearful time of the commencing night. — By the same oversight Br. perverted 26, 142 *avalidantamālam* (adj. bahuvr.) into *avalīdhatamālam*. Çaktideva is taken off to the temple of Cāñdikā to whom he is destined as a victim. Somadeva draws some outlines of the figure of that blood-thirsting goddess. „Her belly was enlarged as if it continually swallowed many lives”, her face is compared to that of Death, but not of Death „devouring *tamāla* with projecting teeth”, as must be inferred from Br.’s text, but „whose rows of teeth are adorned with bells”, for so it is in D: *khacadghanṭāvalidantamālam* etc.

- 26, 20      Br. does injustice to Çaktideva, making him seize the branch of the fig-tree „in his terror”. On the contrary, the hero was fearless, *visādhvasah*, as is edited in D instead of (Br.) *'tha sādhvasāt*.
- 58      D calls the insolent girls who sprinkled the holy hermit with water *atinirbandhinīḥ*, a term more appropriate to the case, since they did so incessantly and with eagerness, than *atinirvartinīḥ* (Br.), a strange and obscure expression in this place.
- 96      The text of D takes away the difficulty of explaining *etad* in *tair etannṛpateḥ*; it exhibits pāda a in this way: *tais tūrṇam nrpater agram*, doubtless the true reading.
- 114      The confusion of *nirvartate* and *nivartate* in mss. is common, cp. my observation in *W.Z.*, XVI, 112. Here Br. has *na nirvartante* erroneously, D as it ought to be, *na nivartante*. Again tar. 44, 107 Br. *nirvṛtte* is inversely corrected in D into *nirvṛtte*, likewise 84, 27 and 104, 150<sup>1)</sup>.
- 136 Br. (= 138 D). Br.’s *tataḥ* disturbs the sense. The sons of Satyavrata did not say, as T must interpret from the text of B: „Brāhmaṇ, you went with our father to search here and there for the Golden City etc.”, but this: „At that time you went with our father to search

<sup>1)</sup> At the former place D has *nirvṛttodvāhamanigalā* and at the latter *nirvartitāhāraḥ*.

for the Golden City, and now you come back alone; how is this?" In D pāda b is *cinvann itas tadā*.

229 Br. (= 231 D) The ascetic Jālapāda, having received from Devadatta the embryo taken out of the womb of the yakṣinī Vidyutprabhā, deceived his mate and consumed the embryo alone, after sending Devadatta away under some pretext, *tat pāṭayitvaiva garbhamānsam*, the reading of Br. T. translates „the great ascetic divided the child's flesh.” But it is obvious that D's reading *tat pācayitvaiva garbhamānsam* is preferable. Jālapāda cooked the fetus in the presence of Devadatta, then he caused him to withdraw that he might enjoy the benefit of eating that dismal food alone and immediately.

233 Br. (= 235 D) Devadatta lamenting over the foul trick of Jālapāda says among other things, „to whom does not excessive compliance entail misfortune?” The Sanskrit original, here translated, is:

*yadi vātyantamrdutā na kasya paribhūtaye?*

To say nothing of the point, whether *mṛdutā* ‘softness, mildness’ may be the equivalent of ‘compliance’, the reading of D

*yadi vātyanta mṛju tā na kasya paribhūtaye*  
is doubtless to be preferred. It is not ‘excessive compliance’ but ‘excessive uprightness’ that makes an honest man the dupe of scoundrels.

259 Br. (= 261 D) In Br. the simile has been made incomprehensible by a bad reading; *ākr̥ṣṭah satataḥ* cannot be right, even if *satataḥ* is considered to be erroneously put for *sataḥ*. D has here:

*ākr̥ṣṭah sattvataḥ Siddheḥ keçapāça ivāyataḥ.*

The embryo drawn out by its neck is compared to the long hair of Fortune seized by the grasp of courage (*sattvataḥ*).

279 Br. (= 281 D) After Çaktideva has become finally a *vidyādhara* and has recovered his four wives in the Golden City, his father-in-law, the king of the *vidyādharas*, bestows on him his kingdom. And before abdicating the old king performs also something else. What this is, is not plain from the text of Br., where the second half of this mālinī strophe has this shape:

*api ca kṛtinam enām Çaktidevanām svanāmnā  
vyadhita samuditena sveṣu vidyādhareṣu.*

T translates this: „and he gave the successful hero his

name by which he was henceforth known among his Vidyādharas. The fact seems as strange as the Sanskrit expression of it (*Çaktidevam svanāmnā vyadhita*). D's text makes the matter sufficiently clear:

*api ca krtinam enam Çaktiv ega m svanāmnā  
vyadhita sam u c itena sveṣu vidyādhareṣu,*

that is: he (the old king) changed the name of his son-in-law a little by transforming (its latter part) *deva* into *vega*, a common name with his vidyādharas. Names ending in -*vega* are frequent among that lofty people. So Madanavega in tar. 30 and foll., Mānasavega 34, 106 etc., Padmavega 64, 62 (ib. 58 Br. *Padmaveça* by mistake, D has *Padmavega*), another Madanavega 87, 7.

**27, 146** In Amaragupta's praise of hunting as an appropriate and useful pastime of kings, T translates Br.'s text: „hunting is approved to give them exercise and excitement, but warlike expeditions are not recommended” (I, 243). The strange second part of this sentence ought to be thus corrected: „for kings who have not exercised themselves in the way of fighting are disapproved” according to D *yuddhād hvani na çasyante rājāno hy akṛtaçramāḥ*.

**185** Br. *paravat sadā*, D *paravartmanā*. For any one who reads the whole story of Karabhaka it must be plain that it is D that exhibits the good reading. The woman whom K. has rescued so that she prefers him to her coward of a husband, prompts him to follow her but „by another way” than that taken by her husband and his company, of course. T (I, 245) has endeavoured to elicit some apposite meaning from Br.'s *paravat sadā* („though I passed for some one unconnected with her”), but that translation not only omits *sadā*, but its content is less appropriate to the course of the tale.

**196** Br. *tatrāntah sthitaylor nau ca, madhyāhne tām tadaiva sā  
mitram me bhrātṛjāyāyās tasyā veçam [= veṣam] akārayat*. The beginning of this çloka is to be accepted, according to the interpunction, as an absolute locative, but what has the awkward mentioning of midday-time in parenthesis to do here? *Madhyāhne* is corrupt. D reads *madhyād etām tadaiva sā*. In fact not the absolute locative is here wanted, but *sthitaylor nau ca* are two genitives to be construed with *madhyāt* and either significative of two couples, „as the two women and we two [the two brahmans] stayed

- there," or the meaning is „as we two also stayed there.”
- 28, 65** The singular conduct of the yakṣinīs, the friends of the apsaras Rambhā, who in order to benefit the king, her lover, fill up his land with heaps of gold by „transforming themselves into trees” (T I, 250), seems to be due to a misread *vr̥ṣta*; Br. took it for *vr̥kṣa*. The yakṣinīs poured down the gold as rain from heaven, a well-known Indian rhetorical image.
- 29, 62** In Br. this cloka is thus edited:
- ajarābhājanibhūtām tām āpraṣṭa* (sic) *Svayamprabhā*.
- Svayamprabhā* takes her leave from *Somaprabhā*. This is, however, impossible, since it is she who had called upon *Svayamprabhā*, with her friend *Kalingasenā*. In fact, it is *Kalingasenā*, who takes leave, as is plain from D:
- ajarābhājanibhūtām tām āpr̥ṣṭa* *Svayamprabhām*  
*Kalingasenām āropya yantra* etc.
- I have connected the two parts of the bahuvrīhi which closes the first line, in D they are by mistake separated (cp. *supra*, p. 92). Cp. also *supra*, p. 88.
- 150** Kīrtisenā, having overheard the conversation of the Rākṣasī and her children about king Vasudatta's disease and the means to cure it, reflects that she may avail herself of that knowledge and save the life of that king who deserves it, for „he takes but small duties” from the merchants. In Br. this deliberation is made obscure by a fault; in cl. 150 *etām evāṭavīm so 'lpaçulkaḥ prāntasthito vahī* the acc. has no verb to rely upon, and *bahī* after *prāntasthitah* is a tantology. Better D:
- etām evāṭavīm so 'lpaçulkaḥ prāntasthito 'vati,*  
 = „by the small duties he takes he is a bliss for this forest-region.”
- 31, 3** *Kalingasenā* tells her friend *Somaprabhā* that her father wishes to give her in marriage to Prasenajit, who is an old man, but Udayana, so she says, the king of Vatsa, is young and handsome, you have told me, „so first shew me Pras., and then take me there, where the king of Vatsa is” (T I, 276). In the original text *kathārūpe* defies the hermeneutical art; T's rendering by „in the course of conversation” cannot be approved of. D makes the cloka intelligible, which runs thus:
- Vatseṣas tu yathā rūpe twayaiva kathitas tathā  
 śrutimārgapravistena hṛtam tena yathā manah,*

„but you have described the beauty of the king of Vatsa in such a way that —.”

27 and 29 D restores the true reading of two clokas, which are obscure in Br.'s text. Citralekhā has delivered to Aniruddha the love-message of Uṣā, and having excited thereby his eagerness to see Uṣā, she takes him up to her, „looking exactly as he had before appeared in Ushá's dream”, as T (I, 277) endeavoured to render B's text:

*ādāya cāttatadrūpam svapnāvatāra eva tam;*  
yet it is plain that neither of the two compounds *āttatadrūpan* and *svapnāvatāre* properly convey the meaning given to them in the translation. D has *ādāya cāttatadrūp as v a p n a v r t t ā n t a m eva tam* = „took him, having made him know the story of her dream, just as it was.” — Her joy when beholding him is thus described apud T. l. l. „When Ushá beheld that Anir. arrived in bodily form, resembling the moon, there was a movement in her limbs resembling the tide of the sea”; a note at the bottom of the page informs the reader that „*velātā* is evidently corrupt”. So indeed it is. Instead of वेलाता D has वेलाना. The cloka is very plain in D, where it runs thus:

*sā drṣṭvaiv Āniruddham tam Uṣā sākṣād upāgatam  
amṛtāñçum ivābodhiv elā nāngesv avarata*  
= „when U. beheld A. arrived in bodily form, her limbs could not contain the emotion within her, as little as the seatide can do so under the influence of the moon”. Accordingly the hypothetical expedient of Böhtlingk (PW VI, 1375, s. v. *velā*) falls away. The expression *nāngesv avarata* to signify an exuberant sudden joy is well-known. A variation of it occurs t. 110, 112: *Kalingasenā tam drṣṭvā jāmātaram athātmajam / trailokyे 'pi na māti sma sveśv aṅgesu tu kā kathā* (cp. also *supra*, p. 66).

35 D *ānaya t param* better than B *ānayet param*. T's translation ‘might take up a strange man’ is not wholly inconsistent, but the imperfect tense does better.

32, 56 Br. = 55 D is a general sentence, incorporated by Böhtlingk in his „Indische Sprüche”, who translates it thus: „Wenn ein Weiser unter vielen Toren geräth, so ist er sicher verloren, wie eine Wasserrose, die auf den Pfad der Wellen geräth.” This „Pfad der Wellen” answers to *pathas tarāṅgānām* of the text of Br. T, who rests on

the same text, has likewise: „A single wise man fallen among many fools, like a lotus in the path of the waves, is sorely overwhelmed.” But it is not in the habit of Sanskrit rhetoric to employ comparisons of such an arid character, and further the plural *pāthas* cannot be accounted for. How much better the çloka appears in D:

*eko bahūnām mūrkhanām madhye nipatito budhah  
padmah pāthas tarangānām iva viplavate dhruvam.*

So we get a well elaborated simile and, at the same time, a pun. The one wise man fallen among many fools is like a lotus fallen on the waves. Either of them *viplavate*, the wise man because he comes into distress, the lotus inasmuch as it floats about on the back of the waves. *Pāthas* = ‘water’ is quoted in the Petr. Dict. from our author twice, 27, 122 and 73, 194; it is also met with 102, 54 and 103, 57.

87 Br. = 86 D is thus rendered: „Whom will not a wicked woman kill, when won over by another man, like a sword in an enemy’s hand, since enticed by love she commits reckless crime without being taught” (T I, 285). The last three words look rather odd in this connection. Yet T rendered faithfully Br.’s reading *açikṣitā*; D has *açāṅkitā*, „without any scruple”, doubtless right.

35, 58 A misreading of what he found in his mss., is the cause, it seems, of *kāñthakaih* put by Brockhaus for *kandukaih*. By the vicious reading the pun is lost. D has:

*utpatadbhiḥ patadbhiç ca hanyamānaiḥ svapāninaḥ  
ciram mṛgaiç ca śīñhaiç ca krīditvā kanduka air iva.*

The king killing in the sport of the chase antelopes and lions makes the impression as if he played with balls; *utpatati* denotes the ‘rising up’ of the wounded or hunted deer and at the same time the ‘jumping’ of the ball; both *patanti*, the animals, when hit and unable to arise from the ground, the balls, when coming down.

37, 85 The elegance of the expression is enhanced, if we read with D *rāgi n strīcittam etāndr̥k*, where *rāgin* is a vocative. Br. has *rāgistrīcittam*.

38, 28 The hetaera Madanamālā conjectures that the Rajput who visits her must be a person of high condition for the reason given in this çloka, which has in Br. this form:

*sá tam kakshyásu sákúta-nirvraṇita-hayádikam  
çrutvā parijanād, matvā pracchannam kamcid uttamam.*

T thought the adj. *nirvraṇita* must convey this meaning, that the king in disguise by his appearance alone cured wounded horses and other animals. So he translated the *çloka* accordingly (I, 348), adding in a note a parallel taken from one of the romantic stories about Launcelot. Yet such cures are wholly out of place in our passage, which treats of the horses and elephants of a rich hetaera in the style of *Vasantasenā* (*Mṛcchakaṭī* act. IV) not of war-horses, and of a king who never is represented as a possessor of supernatural power. T himself remarks that, with this acceptance of the text, *sākūta* cannot be translated, but reading *sākūtam*, as he does with one MS, implies the necessity of construing that adverb with *çrutvā*, something improbable on account of the distance which separates both words. Now it appears from D that B's *nirvraṇita* is nothing but a misread *nirvarṇita*:

*sā tapū kakṣyāsu sākūtanirvārṇitahayādikam* etc.

T's translation should, therefore, be amended thus: „She having heard from her attendants that, as he passed through the zones, he contemplated with interest the horses and other animals”. Now it is indifferent whether we read *sākūta*° or *sākūtam*.

103 (Br.) *sā tasmai veda-saṅkhyātān dadau suvarṇa-pumbhujān* can mean nothing else but ‘she gave him the arms of golden men, which arms are counted (or: enumerated) in the Veda (or: Vedas)’. This purport does not at all suit the course of the tale. For this reason, to get at least something intelligible out of it, T translated the line quoted: „she gave him as many arms of the golden figures as he knew Vedas”, and this Somadeva has doubtless meant, cp. vs. 118. Yet the proper expression is found in D: *veda-saṅkhyākān*. — Some verses below (106) D has *arājarakṣitē kṣemam nāśmin me kāñcanē bhavet*.

39, 106 It is plain that (D) *saṅghātayati* is the true reading, not (B) *saṅghāttayati*, the meaning being ‘he assembles’. And vs. 118 (D) *kṣipram* seems preferable to (Br). *kṣemam*.

40, 21 Çakra admonishes a brahman who thinks he may acquire wisdom without learning and study by mere *tapas*, that he is wrong striving after something impossible. Such a wish, says he, is like longing for writing without letters, painting in the air or horns of a hare. Br. is here totally corrupt, the first pāda *rūpyam çācavīśāne vā*

defies interpretation, cp. T's note on I, 370. Every difficulty disappears in D, which has

*i y a m ḡaçavīṣāñ e c c h ā v y o m n i vā citrakalpanā  
anakṣaro lipinyāśo yad vidyādhyayanam vinā.*

This çloka is found with the selfsame words in Kṣemendra's Br̥hatkathāmañjarī, XIV, 342 (p. 496 of the printed edition). For the rest cp. Bhartṛhari Nītiç. stanza 4.

- 34 The words with which Marubhūti, that drunk and quarrelsome fellow, addresses Gomukha convey a convenient meaning in D, which in Br. has been lost owing to bad readings. T (I, 371) translates: „There is power in the speech of G., but there is no might in the arms of men like you. A garrulous, quarrelsome, effeminate person makes heroes blush.” This is a good rendering of Br.

*balam Gomukha-vācy eva, na tu bāhvor bhavādriçām;  
vācālah kalahī klīvas trapākṛid bāhuçālinām,*  
but it has a strange purport. A *miles gloriosus*, like Marubhūti, never would avow that a garrulous poltroon, as he takes Gomukha, should make him blush! In D the pāda *c* is *vācālaiḥ kalahaḥ klibaiḥ*. Adopting this reading and dissolving Br.'s compound *Gomukhavāci* into two separate words, we get the genuine form of our çloka:

*balam Gomukha vācy eva na tu bāhvor bhavādriçām.  
vācālaiḥ kalahaḥ klibaiḥ trapākṛd bāhuçālinām*  
„Men like you, G., have only strength in their tongue, not in their arms. It is blameful for heroes to quarrel with effeminate braggarts”.

53. 54 The physician to whom the old king Vilāsaçīla applies to make him young again is a cunning fellow; he promises to fulfil his wish, but only under this condition that the king shall remain for eight months in an underground room alone. The ministers, who do not trust the matter, dissuade the king. „In days of old, they say, there existed herbs etc. which had the power of rejuvenating, but nowadays such a thing is impossible”. The argument with which they assert that opinion is vitiated in Br. by several corruptions. D restores its true form, as follows:

*a dyatve ca çrutāny eva rasāny etāni bhūpate  
sāmagryabhāvāt kurvanti yat pratyuta viparyayam. 53.  
tan na yuktam idam; dhūrtāḥ krīdanty eva hi bāliçaiḥ.  
kim deva samatikrāntam āgacchati punar vayāḥ? 54.*

*„But in the present time, O king, these elixirs<sup>1)</sup> are only heard of [= they do not exist in reality], and owing to the want of proper materials, produce the opposite effect to that which is intended. For this reason, it is not fit [to do] so [as the physician advises]; for rogues do in this way make sport with fools, etc.” I have italicized the phrases, which correct T’s translation, the rest is given with his own words.*

- 81     The cunning physician having succeeded in persuading the king to shut up himself in a subterranean abode, made king in his place a young man, named Ajara. But king Ajara shows little gratefulness to the physician, though he honours him, and avoids to take his advice about state-affairs. The physician in his uneasiness once reminds Ajara that it was he who made him king, whereupon the other answers, ‘you are wrong: it is not you but my *prāktanam karma* that gave me this royal power’. At these words the physician is perplexed and reflects in this manner, as I literally quote from T’s translation (I, 374): „This man is not to be intimidated and speaks like a resolute sage. It is better to overawe that master, *the secret of whose character is instability*, but that cannot be done with this man, so I must submit to him.” I do not understand the purport of the words I have italicized, which seem to be the endeavour to a faithful translation of Br.’s *yad rahasyām tarangatvam*, a clause rather unmeaning, in my opinion. Here, too, D removes the difficulty. The çloka is edited there in this shape:

*yad rahasyāntarangatvam svāmisanyavanānam param  
tad api kṣamate nāsmīn. anuvartyas tad esa me.*

Its purport is quite different. „Even the most excellent means to gain one’s master’s favour, the possessing a secret in common is useless with this man; so I must submit to him”.

- 42, 166     D *tad grhāṇa tvam evaitatkhadgam, niṣṭriṇçakarmikām*  
*atyaktajātidharmām mām etenaiva nipātaya*  
 (cp. T I, 387, 2) „so take you his sword etc.”, manifestly a correction of Br.’s text, where *nistrīṇçakārmikām* is quite unmeaning.

<sup>1)</sup> Perhaps we should correct *rasyāni* [= *rasavanti*]. T’s MS has *ramyāni* (see his note at I, 372).

**43, 248** This gīti stanza in Br. is troublesome, the words *vibhūṣitam sudaçārakulena jaladhim* cannot be understood. T was at a loss how to translate them, see his note on I, 402. All becomes plain in D:

*sarve ca <te> vibhūṣita Sudaçārha kulena jaladhim ākramya  
samupāhṛtām svapatinā vyaktam sodaryamūrtim amṛtasaya  
ajarāṅganāçatayutām āyātām Criyam ivābhyanandañs tām,*

= „and they all welcomed her (viz. Karpūrikā) arrived with her husband (Naravāhanadatta), the ornament of the illustrious family of the Daçārhās, who had brought her over sea, as a manifestation of the very sister of the *amṛta*, yea as if she were Cri accompanied with a hundred of ever young nymphs”. The right acceptation of the epithet *vibhūṣita*° is secured by the comparison of 107, 46, cp. PWK VII, 147 s. v. *sudaçārakula*. Though Naravāhanadatta is a descendant of Arjuna, not of Kṛṣṇa — see our author 9, 6 — he is reckoned to belong to the family of the Daçārhās.

**259** Br. *vinīta-gaganāgalāgamana-khedah* is rendered by T (I, 403) „Naravāhanadatta], having made his party of air-travellers forget the fatigues of the journey”. The inelegant agglutination *āgalāgamana* disappears in D, where the compound has this shape *vinītagaganān g a n āgamanakhedah*. As to *gaganāngāna* = ‘the wide firmament, the sky’ cp. Apte’s Dictionary s. v. *aṅgana*.

**261** Instead of Br. *bhuktvā ’uttaram*, which is no Sanskrit at all, to convey the meaning required here „immediately after (he) had taken food” (T I, 403), D has *bhukto-ttaram*, as usual. Cp. 44, 107. 73, 15. 114, 51. 121, 2. 123, 52. It is only in the last three places that Br. has edited the word as it ought to be; 44, 107 we find again *bhuktvā ’uttaram* and 73, 15 even *bhuktetaram*. Cp. also Kṣemendra (p. 329) IX, 2, 519. (p. 542) XVI, 17.

**44, 65** *etat kṛtvā* (Br.) is a mere slip of the pen, it seems, for *etac chrutvā* (D), which is required.

**108** Prahasta relates to his master his conversation with the king of Crikantha. In Br. his relation begins with this half-çloka:

*deva Crikanthavisaye prabhūm samgatavān ahām*  
where the acc. *prabhūm* is a syntactical monstrum, the

instrum. being wanted. It is plain that D's text, where that line runs thus:

*deva Crikāntha viṣaye prabhraman gatavān aham,*  
has the right reading, and it is highly probable that Brockhaus has misunderstood his mss.; *prabhūm sangata*° and *prabhraman gata*° may be very like to each other in the mss. he had at his disposal. T's translation (I, 410) must accordingly be thus modified: „King, in the course of my wandering I arrived in the country of Crikāntha.”

- 133 When king Janamejaya of Kauçāmbī performs the marriage ceremony of his daughter with prince Sūryaprabha, Br.'s text contains the memorable fact that „he made such a feast, that even the realm of Pluto was exclusively engaged in music and dancing” (T I, 411):

*cakre ca vādyā-nṛittaika-yama-lokam mahotsavam.*

What, may be asked, had king Yama to meddle therewith? Nothing at all, indeed. In D he disappears with his realm, it is there simply said, that „he made a great festival to his guests, which entirely consisted of music and dancing” = *cakre ca vādyānṛittaika māyām lokamahotsavam.*

- 176 D = 177 Br. has *koshṭham* instead of *kotṭam* (D). The same error (in Br.) and correction (of D) 49, 68.

- 186 D = 187 Br. is thus translated by T (I, 414): „Then Śákala, inhabited by that fortunate one, appeared glorious, as if the chiefs of the gods, of the followers of Kuvera, and of the snakes had made in it many deposits of much wealth.” If, however, we read with D in pāda c: *sura-Dhanada-bhujaga-na ga raih* (instead of °*bhujanga-varaih*), this āryā stanza will contain a more convenient meaning: „... . . . . appeared, by its great wealth and heavy treasures, as if it were made up of the cities of the Gods, of Kubera, and of the Snakes, put together”. In pāda b (D) *bhoginā* is preferable to (Br.) *bhāginā*.

- 45, 183 Prince Sunshine (Sūryaprabha) is described lying alone, without any of his many wives, on his couch sleepless. The reason of his sleeplessness, says the poet, was that Sleep (*Nidrā*) herself was angry at him „saying to herself, ‘what is the use of this unloving man, who leaves his wives outside?’” (T I, 423). The original in Br. is:  
„*nīlānehena kim etena svā-priyās tyajatō valih?*”

*iti 'iva nīdrā-strī nītyasya 'ekaikasya 'asya na 'āyayau.*

Here the compound *nīdrā-strī* is suspicious, T translates it ‘the goddess of sleep’, but *nīdrā*, being a feminine noun, does not want the addition of *strī* for the sake of personification, and *nītyasya* in connection with the words following must imply the meaning that Sūryaprabha slept alone habitually; yet, he did so that night exceptionally. Much better is the reading of the second line in D:

*itīva nīdrā strīnītyasya ikaśyāpy asya nāyayau*  
with this appropriate meaning: „The Sleep-deity (*Nīdrā*) thus (considering) did not come to him who was in the habit of female company, though he was alone.”

207 D confirms the correction made by T on account of his MS, and moreover restores in pāda c the true reading *tava paçyatu caiso 'pi* (viz. *rūpam*). See T’s note on I, 424.

46, 28 Br. has here *dr̥ṣtvā* instead of *diṣṭyā* (D), a not unfrequent clerical error.

52 foll. The two rival hosts of the Asuras, who favour Sūryaprabha, and of the Vidyādharaś, the followers of Ārūḍhaçarman, are to meet together at the place named Valmīka, in order to witness the appearance of a sign of future domination. The *lakṣaṇa* of the future Cakravartin over the realm of the Vidyādharaś will there be visible. What that sign shall be, is not expressed in Br.’s text. In the sequel (vss. 62—85) it is narrated that this sign shows itself a quiver, appearing at first in the shape of a serpent. Neither Ārūḍhaçarman nor any of his men was able to lay hold of it, but Sūryaprabha seized it, and in that very moment it changed into a priceless quiver. Now D names the quiver already in vs. 52, it has in pāda c *tūṇam* instead of *tūṇam* (Br.). And in 53 it reads *sainyasamvidhinā*, whereas Br. has *sainye, suvidhinā*. Both variants are real emendations, as clearly appears, if we transcribe the two çlokas in full and modify T’s translation accordingly:

*tasyām cotpadyate tatra lakṣaṇam cakravartinaḥ  
tūṇam. Vidyādhara yānti tatkṛte cātra tām titihim. (52)  
evam Sumeruṇā prokte sainyasamvidhinā dinam  
nītvā prātar yagus tat te Valmīkam sabalā rathaih. (53)*

(T I, 436) „And on that day there is produced there a sign to shew the future emperor, a quiver, and for that reason

the Vidyādharas are going there that day. (I, 437) After Sumeru *had spoken thus*, they spent that day *with the arrangement of the army*, and went on the Morrow to Valmīka in chariots with their army.” I have italicized my modifications. As to *samvidhi*, cp. 115, 8.

- 159      Br. *yá ca 'agamyá hṛití jñáteḥ Sunítha-tanayá tvayá*. The singular *jñáteḥ* is strange to express „your carrying off from her relations”, as T (I, 441) necessarily translates; the connection of the tale excludes here the mention of but one relative. Better is D *hṛtajñāte* = ‘carried off stealthily [= *hṛta* + *ajñāte*].’
- 47, 97     The trifling absence of one vowel-sign has perverted the meaning of the second line of this çloka in Br. A great and undecisive battle has taken place. The night has put an end to it. The wives of Sūryaprabha who have to deplore the loss of relatives fallen in that battle meet together in the night to console each other. „But even on that melancholy occasion [*ruditīnasare*] they indulged in miscellaneous conversation.” For, as the poet adds with a gnomic turn (Br.):  
*strīṇāṁ na ca kṣayo yatra na kathāsv apariçrayāḥ*. It is not easy to understand the last word. *Parāçraya* and its negation *aparāçraya*, whether taken as a tatpurusa or as a bahuvrīhi, seem to be out of place here, nor will *apara* (= other) + *āçraya* (resting place, support) be of use. T, translating the line thus: „there is no occasion on which women are not irrelevant in their talk” (I, 451), has analysed the compound, it seems, in this way *a* + *para* (high[est]) + *āçraya* = „resting on [i.e. treating of] not high [= irrelevant] (matter)”. But this interpretation is forced. The reading of D satisfies better and gives to the saying of Somadeva its very point. D has:  
*strīṇāṁ na ca kṣayo yatra na kathā svapurāçrayā*; the meaning of which is, I think, „there is no occasion on which women would not talk of the *chronique scandaleuse* of their town”.
- 114     It is clear that D *prasādhanojjvalā* is preferable to Br. *prasādena ujjvalā*.
- 49, 24     Br. *darçayámāsa sac-çāstra-vidyā api sa tatkramāt*. That this verse introduces the episode of Guṇaçarman, the gifted minister, displaying his skill at arms, appears

from the sequel. For this reason there can be no doubt that D is right reading instead of *sacchāstravidyā* — a strange turn to express ‘skill in the nobler studies’ (T I, 460) — *cas trāstravidyā* = „his skill in handling both kind of weapons, for striking and throwing”. Similarly at cl. 8 D has the good reading *kalācas trāstravid*, where Br. reads *kalācūstrāstravid*.

102 foll. I cannot account for *koṣanibandhādi* in vs. 102, the reading of both D and Br., but there can be no doubt as to the purport of this word, whether it be corrupted or incorrupted. But the following clokas (103—108) which are quite obscure in Br., recover their proper meaning in D. T did not know how to translate them well and adopted Br.’s conjecture that there must be a gap after 104, cp. the note of Brockhaus on p. 235 of his edition of „Buch VI, VII, VIII” (Leipzig, 1862). From D it appears, however, that nothing is wanting. I write out its text:

- tam ca koṣanibandhādi Gaudām kārayitum nrpam  
 (103) visasarja sa dūtam svam guptam āptam dvijādhamah.  
     tam dr̄ṣṭvā tatra sūdas tam āpto rājānam abhyadhāt:  
 (104) aham te sādhayāmy etat kāryam, mārthakṣayam kṛthāḥ.  
     ity uktrā bandhayitvā tam sa dūtam Guṇaçarmanāḥ  
 (105) sūdo mantrasrutim rakṣann ihāgād viṣadāyakaḥ.  
     tanmadhye ca palāyyaiva tato nirgatya bandhanāt  
 (106) Guṇaçarmāntikam dūtas tadiyāḥ so 'bhypāgamat.  
     tenādhigatavṛttānenoktvā sarvam sa darçitah  
 (107) sūdo mahānase 'smākam praviṣṭo Guṇaçarmane<sup>1)</sup>.  
     tato jñātvā sa dhūrtena siपakṛd brahmabandhunā  
 (108) viṣadānodyatas tena tubhyam āvedya ghātitah.

The few corrections in D are important enough to substitute a clear and consistent account for the confused and obscure facts, involved in Br. and to dispel the difficulty mentioned by Brockhaus l.l. „auch fehlt ein Moment in der Erzählung, etc.” It is in cl. 104, not 105, that the cook of the Gauda king is spoken of at the first time. Queen Açoκavatī, in her anger against the faithful minister Guṇaçarman who had declined her propositions of love, makes a false report of him to king Mahāsena, her husband, telling him this invented story

<sup>1)</sup> So already proposed by conjecture by T, cp. his note 2 on I, 464.

of herself: Guṇaçarman had despatched one of his servants as a messenger to the Gauḍa king to make a bargain for the sake of treason. Thereupon the cook of the Gauḍa counselled his lord to commit to himself the work of killing Mahāsena by poison; so he might reach his aim without loss of money (*mārthakṣayam kṛthāḥ* 104). The cook then, after persuading his master and making him cast into prison Guṇaçarman's messenger, that the secret could not transpire (*mantrasrutim rakṣan* 105), set out for Ujjayinī to perform his purpose. In the meanwhile the messenger made his escape from prison, succeeded in coming back to Guṇaçarman and told him that which had happened. Thus informed G., realizing that he could make no profit by the murder of Mahāsena, his master, overtook the cook in the royal kitchen, in which he had entered already and „denounced him and so had him put to death”.

The only difficulty that remains is in the first pāda of 106. If the text is genuine, it is 1<sup>ly</sup> said that the messenger *ran away and made his escape* or even more literally, *made his escape from prison after running away* and 2<sup>ly</sup> *tanmadhye* = „in the meanwhile”. Both statements are improbable: the former implies an awkward mode of expression and a *ὕστερον πρότερον* opposite to the habits of Sanskrit composition; as to the latter, *tanmadhye* is not synonymous with *atrāntare* and cannot have another meaning but „in the midst (amid) of it (them)”. I propose to correct the evident corruption by conjecture:

*tad rākṣa cāpalyenāiva tato nirgatya bandhanāt*  
= „afterwards (*tataḥ*), having made his escape from prison *in consequence of the negligence of his gaoler(s)*”. This correction restores the sense and is not inconsistent with the paleographical account of the origin of the depravation of the text.

120 D = 121 Br. „For in the beginning wicked women sprang from Lying Speech”. So T (I, 464) translates the line which in B runs thus:

*ādāv asatya-vacanāt pāpā jātā hi kustriyāḥ.*

The double designation of the wicked women by *pāpāḥ* and by *ku-* makes us suspect the genuineness of the transmitted words. D, indeed, has this different wording:

*ādāv asatya-vacanām pācāj jātā hi kustriyāḥ*

= „For in the beginning Lying' Speech was born, thereafter wicked women”.

227—229 D = 229—231 Br. In four places of these three çlokas D's text greatly improves both the style and the sense. It has (227) *sukham* and *vāñchasy* [as T already proposed, I, 470 n. 1] instead of *svayam* and *vāñchaty* (Br.); (228) *tadesa* for *na dosho* (Br.); 231, where Br. *more solito* has left out a full word [cp. *supra*, p. 68], it fills up the gap, reading *tisṭhā* <*jñāto*> *yathechasti*. Accordingly T's translation (I, 470) is to be modified in such a manner as I indicate by italicizing my corrections. „And as for your *striving for happiness by abandoning* the body, in this also you are led astray, for in the next world suicides suffer more severe pains than here. *Therefore, this folly is* unbecoming to one so young and wise *as you are*: decide for yourself: you must certainly do what I tell you. I will have made for you here a spacious and beautiful subterranean dwelling; marry Sundarí and live at ease in it *unknown*”.

50, 4 T has very well seen that *Çavarā api* (Br.) cannot be right. The wild Çabarās have nothing to do in this battle of Asuras and Vidyādhara-s. He was also right in supposing, that the arrows are meant, not the wild forest-tribes. D reads the pada *yudhyante sma çarā api* „even the arrows (shot by the two hosts) fought with each other”.

54 Brahmā counselling Indra to make peace with his foes ends his speech with the words, rendered by T (I, 474) thus: „These are now favoured by Śiva, so it is not now a time of victory for you, make peace with your foes”. The original concluding line is in Br.:

*tad na 'ayam jaya-kīlo vah, samdhim kuruta vigrahaiḥ.*  
I do not think, T intended to make a literal rendering of the last word, which is here quite unmeaning, for neither „with wars”, nor „with bodies” — what other meaning can *vigrahaiḥ* purport? — is consistent with the context. Now, D once more restores the sense. It has: *samdhim kuruta kiṁ grahaiaḥ?* = „make peace: what is the use of fighting?” This meaning of *graha* is registered in PW, s. v., II, c, § „Kampfanstrengung = रणोचन”, but only testified to from dictionaries, cp.

also PWK, II, s. v. II, c, ७, where the sphere of this signification is extended.

D 157 = Br. 158 Here, too, D's text is decidedly preferable:

*tatraitām ca ghaṇāç leṣadaçanacchadakhaṇḍanaiḥ  
tyājayitvā çanair lajjām navodhāsulabhām tataḥ.*

Br. has *cumbanāçlesha*<sup>o</sup> and *vyājayitvā* *çanaiḥ kāntām* *navodhām su*<sup>o</sup>. And in 158 (D) = 159 (Br) we read *ratam anāsvāditam anyābhyaḥ*, for *anāsāditam*.

52, 185 T (I, 503 *in fine*) „Then Jīvadatta rose up delighted and praised Durgā”. Here B has *nūtāmbikaiḥ*. If it had been possible that T knew the reading *na tāmbitaiḥ* (so D), he would have preferred it, I think, and translated „— and bowed to Durgā” which is more adapted to the situation. Moreover the use of *nuta-* in this very connection, though irreproachable by itself, seems somewhat uncommon.

54, 60 T (I, 528) „After remaining there for four days thus occupied” = *evam sthitvā 'atra caturo divasān* (Br.). D has a more elegant turn: *evam sthitvā tricaturān divasān*. ‘— for three or four days’.

235 The second part of this cloka is a sententious saying of the poet on the occasion of the capture of some queen by the king after vanquishing her husband and making him a prisoner. Her he put into his zenana and she underwent that change of husbands rather willingly; for, says Somadeva,

*kāmamohapravṛttānām çabālā dharmavāsanā.*

So D, Br. has *capalā*, not *çabalā*. I think, D is right, and translate the sentence in a manner somewhat different from T (I, 536): „in those who *act up to their desires* (*kāma*) or *their delusion* (*moha*) the impressions of virtue (*dharma*) are *impure* [properly: variegated, spotted, viz. have lost their white, pure colour]”.

239 D *evam bahūn api ripūn rabhasa pravṛttān... jayati* is doubtless better than Br. *samarapravṛttān*; that it is a victory ‘in the front of battle’ is expressed by *samyugamūrdhni* in *pāda d* and is not in need of another tautological expression.

241 In Br. *niṇāya samgitarasāgatām tathā / niçām sa gāyan svayam aṅgānāsakhaḥ* etc. the second word is difficult to analyse without hurting either the grammar or the sense. T's (I, 537) translation, therefore, is philologically speaking,

insufficient; *sāngītarasāgatā niçā* is not adequate to a „night, which was *devoted* to the amusement of a concert”. D has, indeed, a different reading *nīnāya sāngītar aśāc ca tām* etc.; „as he was fond of music, he spent that night etc.”

- 55, 9 Erroneous division of one word into two — *mūrkha bhāvah* instead of *mūrkhabhāvah* — impairs the understanding of Naravāhanadatta's reproach of Mārabhūti that he has answered with a joke the claim of his servant, whose wages he had not paid. T's translation of this line (I, 537) „what are you thinking about, you fool? Your intentions are not over-creditable” depends on Br. In D the line has this form:

*kim evam mūrkhabhāvas te nādhikeyam matis tava.*  
I take both sentences for interrogations and translate thus: „Is your stupidity (still) such? Does your wit not exceed it?”

- 27 T, rendering this cloka into English, subjoins in a note (I, 538) „the puns here defy translation.” The poet uses here the rhetorical figure named *parisañkhyā*. In Br. it encompasses three links, but in D there are four. It is obvious that D's reading:

*yatra bandhah kariगirām c h e d a h pattrēsv adṛṣyata  
bhāṅgo 'lakṣeṇa nārīyām sasyasamgrahane khalah.*  
is preferable to that of Br. (*sadā* instead of *chedah*).

- 67 „And then she made me paint a very handsome youth, slowly tracing out the form on the ground with trembling, nectar-distilling hand, to guide me”. (T I, 540). What is a *nectar-distilling hand* that traces a form on the ground? This is hard to understand. From D it appears that (Br.) *pāñinā 'amṛita-vartinā* is a false reading. In D the line runs thus:

*ity uktvā cepamānenā pāñinā d h r t a vartinā.*  
It is not a nectar-distilling, but a *pencil-holding* hand that traces the figure of the young man.

- 79 Roladeva, having excited the curiosity of king Kanakavarṣa about the princess whose likeness he has painted, is summoned to show the picture. He obeys and
- tato valgulikāntahstham dṛṣṭvā paṭam adarçayat  
sa citrakrit tām citrasthām rājño Madanasundarim.*
- So Br. The painter accordingly „shewed the king Madana-sundarī in a painting” (T I, 540) but the preparatory

action is here rather obscure. T's translation „Then the painter looked out a piece of canvass which was in a bag” endeavours to make the best of it. Especially *dr̥ṣṭvā* is strange in this connection, where one expects to read that Roladeva drew the painting out of the bag. Yet D has this very sense, reading:

*tato valgulikātās tam kṛṣṭvā paṭam adarçayat*

„Then the painter drew the piece of canvass from the bag etc.”

- 175 Kanakavarpa enters the temple of Kumāra, which bears the epithet of „sanctifying temple” (T I, 545) in Br. (*viveča garbhahavanaṁ tasya devasya pāvakam*). For the last word D has *pāvakeḥ*. Pāvaki is an epithet of Kumāra = Skanda Kārttikeya.
- 216 T's translation (I, 547) of the account how the king escaped the assault of the furious elephant is right as far as it expresses that which ought to be said in Br. „When the king saw that, he fled by a way full of holes etc.” is not an adequate rendering of *tam dr̥ṣṭvā ḡvabhra-márgena sa rājā upācarat tathā*. D, once more, presents the right reading *rājāpasarat tathā*.

- 234 Kanakavarpa has regained his wife and returns home, passing by the possessions of his father-in-law, king Devaçakti. How, then, is it likely that Somadeva related his arrival at the residence of Devaçakti, in the way as is related apud T (I, 548): „And in a few days he reached the residence of his father-in-law, a hermitage in the country of Vidarbha, and after that his wealthy city of Kunḍina”? A reigning king does not keep his residence in a *hermitage*. From D it appears that it is not Somadeva but some copyist's error that brought in the word *āçramam*, as is edited in Br.; D has *āçritam*. Here is the whole prthvī stanza, in its corrected shape:

*avāpa ca sa vāsaraiḥ katipayair gr̥ham cēñuram  
Vidarbhaiṣayāçritam tad atha Kuṇḍinākhyam puram |  
samṛddhimati tatra ca ḡvāçurasatkṛtaḥ kānicid  
dināny abhajata sthitim tanayadārasenāyutah ||*

Therefore, he did not come at first to „a hermitage” in Vidarbha and afterwards to Kunḍina, but it is narrated, that he reached Kunḍina, the capital of his father-in-law, situated in Vidarbha, and stayed there for some days.

56, 78—80. Br. supposes here a gap of two lines (79 b, 80 a in his edition); probably he was induced to do so by the beginning of 80 b *iti nirbandhaprṣṭā ca*. But there is nothing wanting. D reads *atimirbandhaprṣṭā ca*. When the Mothers asked her the first time, she laughed without giving reason of her laughing (*sā jahāsa tu nābravīt*). But on their strong instances, she told it them.

57, 12 In the story of the porter who found king Udayana's bracelet and sold one jewel out of it, a slight correction in the text and accordingly in T's translation (II, 2) is to be obtained from D, where the cloka 12 is thus edited:

*etac chrutvā sa Vatsegas tatrānāyayati sma tau  
bhārikam tam savalayam saratnam vānijam ca tam.*  
Udayana summoned the porter to come with the bracelet and the merchant with the jewel. Br. has *savinayam sadratnavānijam*. Likewise cl. 9 D corrects the vicious reading of Br. *sadratnakatakam*, reading *saratnam kaṭakam* „a bracelet beset with jewels.”

16 Though the lectionis varietas of this cl. — Br. *rakṣārtham*, D *ratnārtham* — does not affect the sense, I greatly doubt, whether *rakṣārtham* may have, in good Sanskrit, the meaning of „for keeping for himself” and for this reason should prefer the reading of D.

58, 98 In the „story of Vajrasāra whose wife cut off his nose and ears” (T II, 14 foll.) the ironical turn of the poet's words representing the state of mind of the foolish husband whom his passion of sensual love compels to deliver himself to the rage of his faithless wife is almost lost in the corrupted form of cl. 98 b in Br. For *citto*, as is edited there, D has *citraṇi*, having the line as follows:

*trṇasārīkṛtaç citraṇi Vajrasāro Manobhuvā*  
„it is a wonder, how a Vajrasāra [= who has the hardness of a diamond] was made by the Love-god to a trṇasāra [= who has the hardness of stubble]?” — Some lines before, cl. 91 a, D reads *upavecya* for *upaviçya* (B); rightly, for, when he had entered the dense wood, he made sit down his wife before speaking to her.

113. 114 In the relation of the prowess of Simhabala fighting lions and elephants in the wilderness, two variances of reading are remarkable, since they slightly change the meaning. According to D, he did not strip the elephant whom he killed of his jewel (T II, 16) but he made the

elephant fall down roaring. Instead of *muktaratnam* (Br.) D reads *muktāratim*, cp. 52, 123 where the same adj. is found, in the same situation, in both editions (cp. also 70, 94 the partic. *āraṭatsu*). And in the comparison of the bandits overthrown by him with lotusponds trampled down by an elephant, D adds the adject. „fresh” to the subst. “lotuses”; it reads cl. 114 thus:

*ekākī taskaracamūr vidala n nava pañkajāḥ  
mamāthāranyavikrāntaḥ kari kamalinīr iva.*

By this the cloka recovers its genuine form. In Br.’s text (*vidalann iva*) the repeated *iva* is intolerable, and *pañkajāḥ* (acc. fem.!?) disturbs the sentence. In D *navapañkajāḥ* is a bahuvrihi and the attribute of *kamlinīḥ*.

- 139     *Samam* (Br.) appears from D to be a mistake. In D the triṣṭubh is edited in its original form:

*tataḥ sa sa mprāpya punaḥ svarājyam  
āniya bhāryām ca pitur gr̄hāt tām etc.*

- 60, 154 D = 155 Br. In the Story of the Lion, the Panther, the Crow and the Jackal it is related how the attendants of the wounded lion contrive a plot by which they will induce the camel to offer himself his own body to the lion. The crow who is charged with the execution of the contrivance entices the camel by a false message to make that offer. This part of the story is introduced by a cloka which is somewhat different in Br. and in D. Br.: *ity ukte tair, anujñātas tena siṅhena vāyasaḥ*

*vidhāya sañvidam, gatvā karabham tam abhāshata.*

D: the first line identical, the second: *vadhāya sañvidam kṛtvā karabham* etc. We may supersede to demonstrate that and why D’s reading seems to be better Sanskrit. T’s translation (II, 36) should be modified, in accordance with it, in this manner: „When they had said this, the crow, by the permission of the lion, after arranging the plot to kill him, addressed that camel with these words.”

- 61, 126 The snare in which the antelope *Citrāṅga* is caught, is called *kālapāṇa* in Br. — in T’s translation (II, 52) „the fatal noose” — but *kīlapāṇa* in D, which word is expressive of the kind of trap used, some pin or wedge being employed.

- 145 foll. In this passage, which treats of the beautiful wife of a jealous husband falling in love with a young Bhilla

with whom she elopes from her house (T II, 53), Tawney has adopted (gl. 147) the reading *pallim* from his MS instead of *patnīm* (Br.). D likewise has *pallim* and these more corrections of Br.'s text: gl. 145 *mārge s a Bhilām aṭavīm agre dṛṣṭvā s a tadbhayāt*, gl. 146 *dṝṣṭā yayau tataḥ* for *dṝṣṭvā* („she boldly eloped”).

**62, 18 and 103** The word *avadya* ‘blameful’ has been twice obscured in this *taraṅga* in Br., whereas it reappears in D. The first line of gl. 13:

*yoddhavyam tena sākam no gatvā 'avaçena çatruñā* (Br.) has this form in D:

*y. t. 8. no kṛtāvadyena çatruñā* = „we must fight with that enemy who acted blamefully towards us”. T (II, 64) translates „we must go and fight with that feeble enemy.” Neither the idea of weakness nor its expression here by *avaça* fit the situation, but *kṛtāvadya* represents the very idea wanted and is its proper expression.

Gl. 103 *kṛtāvādyasya* (Br.) is an obvious misprint for *kṛtāvadyasya*. I do not understand why T (II, 71) has rendered it by „a hereditary enemy.”

**63, 108** In T's translation, II, 84, begins the famous story of the Monkey and the Porpoise, which Somadeva narrates at large and with amplifications. With him, the wife of the porpoise has a confidante by whose intermedium she makes known to her husband her desire of being cured with a soup made of the heart of a monkey. The porpoise reflected: „Alas! how shall I obtain the lotus-like heart of a monkey? Is it right for me to plot treachery against the monkey, who is my friend? On the other hand how else can I cure my wife, whom I love more than my life?” In this reflection, which I quote from T, there is nothing inconsistent, but the words „how else can I cure” do not answer exactly to the text of Br. *sādhyā kim athavā bhāryā*, since not *kim athavā*, but *katham* or *katham anyathā* would be required to represent that meaning. From D it appears that something different is said. Instead of *sādhyā* it has *sakhyā*, and the whole line has accordingly this form, in transcription and adding the punctuation: *s a k h y ā kim? athavā bhāryā prānebhyo 'py adhikapriyā* = „What matters me my friend? It is my wife, forsooth, whom I love more than my life.”

168 In the odd story of the teacher and his two jealous pupils (T II, 88) there is a trait which, owing to the bad reading in Br., is misrepresented. The pupil who washed and anointed every day the right foot of his teacher being abroad, the teacher asks his second pupil who was in charge of his left foot, to wash and anoint the right one also. That pupil refused, as the right foot belonged to his rival. When the teacher insisted „then that pupil, who was the opposite of a good pupil, took hold of his master's foot in a passion, and exerting great force, broke it.” The words, printed in italics are wrong, they rest on Br.'s false reading:

*tato vipakṣah̄ sac-çishyād roshād ádāya tasya tam  
guroḥ çishyah̄ sa caranam̄ balād gādhāc ca bhagnavān;*  
here the awkward and not idiomatic expression *vipakṣah̄ sacchisayāt* to denote ‘a bad pupil’, the tasteless style unworthy of an elegant poet such as Somadeva, and the strange turn *balād gādhāt* made me a priori suspicious about the genuineness of the lines thus edited. All this trouble vanishes, if we adopt the redaction of D :

*tato vipakṣat a cchisay a r o ṣād ādāya tasya tam  
guroḥ çishyah̄ sa caranam̄ balād grāv nā ca bhagnavān  
= „then this pupil, in a fit of anger at the (other)  
pupil, his rival, took hold of that foot of his master  
and broke it violently with a stone”.*

179 D = 180 Br. The „Story of the snake with two heads” contains several various readings in Br. and D which do not affect the meaning. A bad reading of the concluding cloka, which he found in his mss., induced Brockhaus to suppose a gap of one cloka between 178 and 180. This is quite unnecessary, if we read with D :

*avaṭe 'gnau paribhraṣṭo mārgādr̄ṣter adahyata.*

184 D = 185 Br. In the story of the foolish man who had put a handful of rice into his mouth in the house of his father-in-law and was surprised by his mother-in-law, it is said in T's translation (II, 89) „his mother-in-law, seeing that his throat was swollen and distended.” Of course, there can be no question of his *throat*, though Br. edits *gala*, D has the very word required here, *galla*: *tatpinocchūnag a l l a m̄ ca*. This correction restores at the same time the fault against the metre in Br. He had not a swollen throat, but a swollen cheek.

- 64, 101** Dhanadeva returning home is informed of the misconduct of his dissolute wife. She lets down every night a basket, „and whoever enters it is drawn up into the house, and is dismissed in the same way at the end of the night. And the woman is always stupefied with drink, so that she is absolutely void of discernment.” (T II, 96). The last sentence is cl. 101, c. d. In Br. it has this shape  
*pána-mattā 'avaçá naiva vicárayati kimcana.*

In D it is edited as follows:

*pānavattā ca sā naiva nibhālayati kimcana.*

*Pānavattā* must be a misprint, Br. *pānamattā* is right. But the other variance of D, which I have marked by spacing, restores the original wording, misread by Br. Note the new instance of the verb *nibhālayati* ‘to consider’. — In cl. 102 D *bahukālo gato* is also an improvement (Br. *bahukālagato*).

- 67, 57** The merchant who tells Naravāhanadatta his adventures, narrates his despondency, when the news was spread of the shipwreck of the vessel on which his bride made the journey to Ceylon. „So I, though comforted by my elders, made up my mind to throw away my property and prospects and I determined to go to that island to ascertain the truth.” (T II, 128). The words printed in italics are the translation of the pāda *vittam āçābhīr akṣipam* (Br.), which for several reasons rouse doubt as to their genuineness. D, in fact, has a much better reading *cittam āçābhīr ākṣipan*. The merchant says, that after the consolation of his elders, „he cherished his mind with hope and determined etc.”

- 70, 31** Crutadhi after saying his name and that of his father, thus continues:

(Br.) *sa ca mayā saha*  
*durbhikshe mṛtajātiḥ san bhraman prāpad imām bhuvam*  
 „and once in a time of famine he was wandering about with me, and he reached this place almost dead” (T II, 148). These last words ‘almost dead’ have to render *mṛtajātiḥ*, but this translation is impossible. The compounds in *°jātiya* are synonymous with those ending in *°kalpa* = ‘almost’, but not those in *°jāti*, and if *mṛtajāti* signifies anything, it must be = ‘having lost by death his clan (or caste)’. Br.’s reading is the consequence of a misreading. D has *mṛtajāniḥ* ‘having lost by death his wife’, and

so Somadeva wrote, as is confirmed by the parallel passage in Kṣemendra, where the cause of her death, too, is reported. She starved from hunger, after giving away her food to a beggar:

*tataḥ kadācit durbhikṣe mātā me nijabhojanam  
dattvārthine kṣudhārtāya dhanyā tatyāja jīvitam* (IX, 1, 196).

95 In this cloka the interrupted meditation of some merciful ascetic is mentioned ‘who discharged fire at the webs’ (T II, 151) of two sets of spiders, hanging one on wholesome flowers and the other on poisonous flowers. This allegorical representation of the power of *tapas* and *dhyāna* to destroy the textures of *karma*, though consistent with the whole imagery sketched, is not quite accurate if tested by the very words of the original. T translated Br. *kenāpi jālato muktā tato jvālā tapasvinā*. Now, it is impossible to express the conception „to discharge fire at the webs” by the words *jālato jvālām muñcati*. The word ending in “*tas*” can only signify the source of the fire, not its aim. Here again, D restores the hand of Somadeva, who wrote *kenāpi bhālato muktā* etc.; the ascetic *made fire break forth out of his forehead*. Cp. Çiva’s front-eye, e. g. Kathās. 104, 2, where *bhālekṣana* has remained intact in Br. Br̥hatkathāmañjari, IX, 1, 236, the parallel place has also *tal lālāta samutthāgni*°.

71, 39 The queen says to the warder, apud T (II, 156) „When the king was seized that day by monsters in the water of the Narmadā, Mṛigānkadatta alone was ready to rescue him”. I do not object to this translation, but the verb *was seized*, which is here indispensable, does not answer to Br. *āghrāto ’bhūt*. One would rather expect *ākrānto ’bhūt*, as is, in fact, found in D.

147 An anusvāra wrongly put, or perhaps even wrongly believed to have been put on the aks. **Q** has disturbed the wording of the first line of this cloka in Br. T (II, 161) thus translating: „Out on the spite of destiny! she brings trouble on her handiwork, even when full of excellencies” made the best of it. But his rendering of *āñhaḥ* (sin) by ‘trouble’ proves his conviction that a literal translation would lead him to nonsense. Now, if we put together Br.’s text

*guṇavatyāṁ sva-sriṣṭāv apy aṅho; dhig matsaro vidheḥ!*  
and that of D (which I transliterate, adding the punctuation)

*guṇavatyāṁ svāśr̥ṣṭāv apy aṅho dhin matsaro vidheḥ!*  
there can be no doubt, I suppose, that the latter alone is right. Hamsāvalī exclaims: „O! What a pity that Destiny feels jealousy towards her creation, even when full of excellencies!“

- 252 In Hamsāvalī's outcry the words *hā viparitanidhe vidhe!* (Br.) are translated by T (II, 167) „alas! Destiny, source of untowards events!“ But *nidhi* means ‘treasury’ not ‘source’; if T. had put ‘treasury’, the likeness would have lost its proper application. Br. has been induced into error, it seems, by his MSS reading *°nidhe* instead of *°vidhe*, as is edited in D, which makes a better meaning. „Alas! she cries, Destiny, operator of wrong decisions.“ Cp. *supra*, p. 70.

- 295 *Udghāṭa* has been misunderstood by T (II, 169). He was misled by the acc. pl. in Br. From D it is clear that the right reading is *smṛtvodghāṭāt*, abl. sing. *Udghāṭa* has among others the meaning ‘hint’, ‘allusion’ — cp. PWK, I, 231, s. v. 5) „das zur Sprache kommen“ testif. Kathās. 17, 3 —, and so it must be understood here. Owing to Crutadhi's hint about the wondrous peacock, the king of the Bhillas changes his mind. Parallel places of ours are 35, 27 and 68, 11 *tac chrutaiva tadudghāṭāt smṛtvā*, where Br. has *udvāṭāt* „fehlerhaft für udghāṭa“ PWK, I, 234. Cp. Kathās. 3, 65 *upodghāṭa* with a similar sense, and 27, 79; in both places this word is a neuter. Mudrārākṣasa Act III (beginning) *kim anena vah prāṇahareṇa kathodghāṭena?*

- 72, 292 The young merchant Malayamālin has miserably fallen in love with the king's daughter. His friend, on hearing that cause of his sorrow and altered state, reminds him of the hopelessness of his love. „Let the swan, he says, desire the beautiful face of the lotuses of all ordinary lakes, but what has he to do with the delight of enjoying the lotus of that lake, which is the navel of Viṣṇu?“ (T II, 185). By the bye, I remark that there is here perhaps some pun on *lakṣmī*, which T has translated by ‘delight’, and which may also signify the wife of Viṣṇu. In fact, the princess is as distant from the merchant as

Lakṣmī is from the swan. But it is not for this reason that I treat of this place, but because of the discrepancy between Br. and D. Br.'s text runs thus (292 b, 293 a):

*hañso vāñchatu nāma 'anya-saro-'mbuja-mukha-çriyam,  
hari-nábhi-hradámbhoja-bhoga-lakṣmyā sa kah punah?*

whereas D reads:

*hamso vāñchatu nāmānyasarombujas ukhaçriyam  
Harinābhihradāmbhojabhogalakṣmyā h sa kah punah?*

The reading *sukha* for *mukha* is an evident correction; as to the genitive *°lakṣmyāh*, it satisfies better than the instrumental of Br.'s text, which it is not easy to account for. The genitive is the dative-like one; cp. Jātaka-mālā p. 221, 15 *kas tv aham varapradānasya*. Used in this manner with *ka* it is a synonymous turn with the usual idiom *kva.... kva ca* (cp. my *Sanskrit Syntax* § 410 Rem. and Kathās. 74, 204).

- 296 Instead of the meaningless last pāda of Br. *tayā 'ávṛtya 'akarot kriyāh*, T (note on II, 185) from one London MS reads *tayā dhṛtyākarot* etc. D has *tayā vṛttyākārō kriyāh*.

- 73, 81 For (Br.) *prakrishtābhyaṁ* D has *pravīśṭābhyaṁ*, which is more appropriate to the situation. Instead of bestowing on the goddesses Črī and Sarasvatī who claim each for herself the superior rank in Kācmīr, that paradise on earth, the *epitheton ornans* „glorious,” the text of D makes them contend at the time of their entrance in that divine country. After *penetrating into Kācmīr* (and becoming aware of its wondrous loveliness) they exclaim one: „*aham atrādhikā*” and the other: „*nāham*” [= *na, 'aham* Br.].

- 74, 226 From the I.O. MS T (note on II, 226) has adopted the reading *drutam anuddhṛtya* for *anugatya* (Br.), which is out of place. D has another reading, quite satisfactory and almost equivalent to *anuddhṛtya*, viz. *anādṛtya*.

- 75, 41 foll. In the description of king Vikramāditya leaving his palace in the dark night alone and unperceived to assist the sorcerer — introduction of Vetalapañcavimçatikā — D corrects Br.'s text in several places. Besides that (vs. 40) it divides, in accordance with Boehltingk, *Chrestomathie*<sup>2</sup> p. 110, 30, *pratipannām tām*. The two following çlokas have this form:

*pradoṣe nīlavasaṇaś tamālakṛtaçekharaḥ  
niryayau rājadhānitah khadgapāṇir alakṣitah ||  
yayau ca ghoranibidadhvāntavrātāmaṭīmasam  
cītānalograṇa y a n ajvālādāruṇadarçanam ||*

Whether *nayana* is the right correction of *tapana* (Br.), is not certain, but in the first line the new reading seems to make a better sense than Br.'s *nīlavasaṇaś-malañkṛta-çekharaḥ*<sup>1)</sup>, which is not quite = T (II, 233) 'he enveloped his head in a black cloth.' According to D, the king had taken the precaution to wear a black dress and to paint a dark-brown tilaka on his forehead (*tamālakṛtaçekhara*).

- 62      D *tasyābhūd Vajramukutaś tanayo rūpaçauriyayoḥ  
kurvāṇo darpadalānam Smarasyārijanasya ca;*  
*kurvāṇo* for *akarod* (Br.) restores the grammatical structure of the sentences.
- 80      T (II, 235) „What! did you not see, what she told you by her signs?” These words of the minister's son to the prince convey the very meaning of their Sanskrit original, yet, in Br. (and consequently, in Boehltingk's *Chrest.*<sup>2</sup> p. 113) they are badly expressed, the line  
    *kim na dṛiṣṭām twayā, yad yat samyñayā sūcītan tayā*  
can have no other meaning but this: 'did you not see, whatsoever she told etc.' D restores the genuine wording:  
    *.... twayā tad yat etc.*<sup>2)</sup>
- 140     This çloka has become almost unintelligible, owing to a mistake in transcribing of Br., it seems. He has edited  
    *tad muñca manyum etasyām! bandhu-tyágán mahátmanah  
    kuryás tvaṁ, harane yuktiṁ vakshyámy álocayámy aham.*  
From the spelling °*tyágán* and from the interpunction we may suppose that Br. took °*tyágān* for an acc. plur.; this acceptation and the strange asyndeton of the two verbs, one being a future and the other a present tense raise a strong presumption of corruption. T (II, 239) translated rather the purport of his Sanskrit text than its very words. His translation „....persuade the high-spirited woman to leave her relations, and I will invent and tell you an artifice for carrying her off” is virtually right. The right constitution of the text appears from D. I subjoin it, adding the interpunction:

<sup>1)</sup> So Boehltingk, for Br. *samilañkṛta* is an error of print.

<sup>2)</sup> Conversely *yad* must be read with D 118, 167, where Br. has *tad*.

*tan muñca manyum etasyām! bandhutyāgān mahātmanah  
kuryās twām harane yuktim, vakṣyāmy ālocya yām aham.*  
the gen. *mahātmanah* depends on *harane* and *bandhuty*.  
is an abl.sing.

- 78, 37 Vīravara, the heroic officer, who is immediately ready to execute the perilous order of the king, his master, sets out for the weeping woman in the darkest of the night (cl. 36). It is very strange that the poet should describe his behaviour, when starting, so awkwardly as is done in Br.'s edition :

*nava-meghāndhakāram taj-jvalad-vidyud-vilocanam  
sthūla-dhārā-çilā-varshi Raksho jīvam ajīganat* (37);  
in T's translation (II, 252) rendered thus: „He looked upon the world as a Rākshasa black with fresh clouds, having the lightning flashing from them by way of an eye, raining large drops of rain instead of stones”. It is not the comparison of the dark raining night to a Rakṣas which wonders the reader most, but the poet's remark that this imagination rose up in the mind of Vīravara. Now, in D the reading is slightly different, but brings us the natural and proper conception which is wanting in Br.; for *nava* it has *na ca*, and for *Raksho jīvam*: *Rakṣorūpam*. Further *taj* should be loosened from the compound *jvalad* and put aside as a separate word. The whole, then, means this: „*He did not mind that Rakṣas-like darkness, black etc.*”

- 80, 10 T, in his note 2 on II, 312, mentions the reading *tathā* of the Sanskrit College MS. for *tayā* (Br.). Br.'s *priṣṭha mātrā tayā* must be corrupt, as *tayā* cannot be accounted for. But the true correction is in D: *prāsto mātrā r tayā* „when his mother distressed asked him the cause (of his strange behaviour)”.

- 81, 16 The king being astray in the wilderness, asks his dependent and only companion: „Do you know the way by which we came?” The other replies: „I do know it, but let my lord rest here for some time” (T II, 265 *in fine*). T translated well that which must be read in the text, but is not in Br., where we find *vedmi*; *kimcit kṣayām tāvad iha viçrāmyatu prabhuḥ!* the good reading *vedmi kim ca kṣayām* etc. is found in D.

- 82, 47 In the conclusion of the ludicrous tale of „the three fastidious men” who being gone off to fetch a turtle

for their father in behalf of his sacrifice never returned, having made their fortune at the court of a foreign king, the poet laughingly states that „little did they reck of the fact that they had incurred sin by obstructing their father's sacrifice” (T II, 273). The half-çloka of the original translated in this manner, is thus edited in Br.

*pitur vighnita-yajñártham helopárjita-pátkáḥ.*

The word *helā* is inconvenient; if expressive of the obstruction of the res divina, it is a tautology next to *vighnita*, if it denotes the insult wherewith they acted to their father, the word implies too much, for they were guilty of *apramāda*, not *helā*. Moreover, the whole expression *yajñá rtham helā°* is improper. In fact, the text in Br. is corrupt. The true reading is found in D:

*pitur vighnitayañart haphalopárjita-pátkáḥ*  
= „though they had incurred sin by obstructing the success of their father's sacrifice.”

86, 36 It is plain that D reading the second part of this çloka:  
*cirād avāptacayano niçām mantri nināya tām*  
is right, not Br., where it has this form: *cirād apāstacayano* etc. T's translation (II, 286) „the minister, who had long discarded the use of beds, spent that night in his house” is materially satisfactory, but does not exactly answer to the necessary meaning of the phrase *cirād apāstacayanaḥ*, which must imply that Dīrghadarçin had, a long time ago, taken a vow of not sleeping in a bed; *apāstacayanaḥ* = Lat. *abjecto lecti usu*. D's text signifies that „after a long time (*cirāt*) he had got (again) a bed to pass the night, etc.”

88, 11. 12 Br. has here made an odd mistake, editing *muhyamānāḥ* and *muhyāmake* in a place, where it is said that the town was robbed by thieves. The right reading *musyā°* and *musya°* is of course found in D.

89, 76 Manahsvāmin, feigning to acquiesce to an unjust decision of the king concerning himself, protests indirectly by pointing out the king's responsibility for his own actions. In Br. this passage runs as follows:

*kāmām tad astu; rájá tvam dharmádharmau tava 'ucitau*  
= T (II, 305) „I must, I suppose, acquiesce; you are a king, and justice and injustice are matters familiar to you.” How much better D *dharmádharmau tavādyatāu* = „.... from hence the righteousness or injustice

(of that which is to be done) is *yours*;" it is not I who am responsible for it, but you (who are the dispenser of the *dharma*) who are to enjoy the fruit of the right or injustice you have done by your sentence. So we have caught the very argument in the case from an Indian point of view.

**91, 60** Cl. 52—60 contain the verdict of Trivikramasena in the case of the king who died from unsatisfied love rather than to accept the ravishing Unmādinī from the hand of her husband. In its conclusion I prefer D's reading *prānān api sa dharmātmā tatyāja na punah padam / amārge nidadhe* to Br. *prānān api samantāc ca tatyāja* etc.; *samantāt* is a mere *pādapūraṇa*, but nothing can be more appropriate to the context here than *sa dharmātmā*.

**93, 9** In Br. it is said that the relations of the merchant Dhanapāla after his death „seized his property, *as the king did not interfere to protect it.*” (T II, 328). The words I have put in italics answer to *rājāśānāthyād (ākrāntam)* of Br. D has this slightly different text:

*taddhanām rāja sānāthyād ākrāntam atha gotrajaiḥ,* which imports the very contrary, viz. that the relatives robbed the widow of the inheritance *with the assistance of the king.* D's text is supported by Kṣemendra's parallel (IX B 1018) *gotrajaiḥ / hartum dravīnam ākṣiptā tadbhāryā rājasamṛitaiḥ* = „*his relations backed by the king sued his wife to seize the inheritance.*”

**94, 91** King Candrāvaloka is bound to the Brahmarakṣas, whom he had unwillingly obstructed, to deliver him a brāhmaṇ boy of seven years ready to offer himself in sacrifice for the king's sake. When being in a downcast mind, how to fulfil his promise, one of his ministers shows him the way to find out such a boy. „He had made with the utmost rapidity a golden image of a seven-years-old child, and he adorned his ears with jewels, and placed it on a chariot, and had it carried about in the towns, villages, and stations of herdsmen,” with a proclamation of this purport, that if such a brāhmaṇ boy as whose image was being carried about, should willingly offer himself for the good of all the creatures, and his mother and father should permit him to do so and should comply to some other hard and requisite conditions, this image of gold and gems together with

a hundred villages would be given them in reward. In the passage quoted from T's translation (II, 339) the sentences „he adorned his ears with jewels, and placed it on a chariot” are to render this line of Br. *ratnair alamkritām tām ca karṇe, rathārpitām*. It is clear, however, that „to adorn the ears (of the image)” cannot possibly be expressed in Sanskrit by *alamkrtām* (viz. *pratimām*) *karṇe*, and that this phrase is rather a monstrum lectionis. Now, in D this monstrum disappears. For *karṇe rathārpitām* it has *karṇirathārpitām*. So the translation is thus to be modified: „He had made with the utmost rapidity a golden image of a seven-years-old child *and dressed it with ornaments, then he placed it in a palanquin, etc.*” The word *karṇiratha* is found also 27, 168, in both Br. and D; at 120, 118 D and T's three mss. have *karṇirathāvatīrṇā* (see T II, 570 n. 1), this has been corrupted in Br. to *kaṇī rathāvatīrṇā*.

**95, 4** *taṣyām* [viz. *puryām*] *babhūva nrpatih Padmanābha iti çrutah sajjananandakah çrimān ākrāntaBalirājakah.*

T (II, 342) rendered this cloka thus: „In it there lived a fortunate king, named Padmanābha, who was a source of joy to good men, and excelled king Bali.” T failed to realize the intentional ambiguousness of the epithets. King Bali mentioned in the 4<sup>th</sup> pāda needs requires in the name of Padmanābha an allusion to Viṣṇu, one of whose names is, indeed, Padmanābha. Now, D has in the 3<sup>d</sup> pada *saccakra nandakah*. Adopting this reading, we get a worked out pun. King P. is compared throughout with Viṣṇu, the possessor of his good discus (*cakra*) and his sword Nandaka, who overpowered (*ākrānta-*) king Bali. If referred to the king, it is said that he was a source of joy to the pious, and brought into his power tributary kings (*balirāja*); cp. *supra* p. 82.

**98, 35** D *muktā tāraughamanditām* seems to be preferable to B *muktāhāraughā*, for it is not the fact of her being „adorned with many strings of pearls” (T II, 356), but the striking splendour of her pearls of the finest water that makes impression on the mind of Caṇḍasimha. *Tāra* has here meaning 8) in PW, III s.v.

**99, 13** The act of sacrifice to the *Vetāla*, performed by the mendicant, consists of different oblations. The first of them, in Br., is an offering „of white human teeth in a

skull" (*sunirmalaiḥ / nara-dantaiḥ*) by way of an *argha*. In D it is very pure human blood (*sun. nararaktaīḥ*) that is offered as an *argha*.

- 42 After finishing his long narrative: the 25 Tales of the *Vetāla*, Vikramakesarin comes again to speak of his own adventures. This transition makes up the content of an aupacchandasika, the third and fourth pādas of which are in B:

*abhidhāya punar Mṛigāñkadattam  
svakṛitārtham nijagāda rājaputram.*

It is no wonder that T. could not understand *svakṛitārtham*; finding in one of his mss. *sa kṛtārtham* he adopted that reading and translated accordingly „the successful prince M.” (II, 360). But since in fact M. is styled here ‘successful’ in a rather proleptic way — how could he be a *kṛtārtha*, before he had obtained his beloved maiden? — the reading of D must be considered more satisfactory. D reads the 4<sup>th</sup> pāda:

*prakṛtārtham nijagāda rājaputram  
„spoke to the prince (again) of the present subject.”*

- 46 The old man, after giving to Vikramakesarin the powerful spell by means of which he will rejoin Mṛgāñkadatta his master, exhorts him with comforting words to follow his advice which he gives him in return of his being relieved of the serpent’s poison. The cālinī stanza which conveys this exhortation, is corrupt in its 4<sup>th</sup> pāda and the word *duhsarpa* does not occur in it. In Br. the pāda has this shape:

*tvam evaṁ duhsarpa-dahcārti-hartā,  
but in D we have doubtless the good reading  
tvam me bandhuḥ sarpadāmçārtihartā*

“I hold you for my kinsman, since you have rescued me of the pain of a serpent’s bite”, cp. T II, 361.

- 100, 21 In the simile which illustrates the wavering of the foliage of the great and wonderful tree which Mṛgāñkadatta beholds on the shore of the lake, the voices of the birds are fancied to say: not „Let no one question me in any way!” (T II, 363), but „Let no one touch me in any way!” D reads *mā māṇi yathā tathā kaçcit sprākṣid iti*, not *prākṣid iti* (Br.).

- 57 The pṛthvī-strophe that relates the reunion of Mṛgāñkadatta with his ministers, runs thus in Br.:

*tataḥ sa sakalān samam sapadi mantriṇah prāpya tān  
dṛīcā kalatayā girā pramada-manthanārambhayā |  
nareçvara-suto 'dhika-pranayam ekam ekam muhur  
dadarça, parishasvaje tad anu sambabhāshe kṛti ||*

Here the 2<sup>d</sup> pāda puzzles the reader. What may be the meaning of *kalatayā*, put between *dṛīcā* (with his eyes) and *girā* (with his voice). Boehltingk declared it a misprint for *kalanayā* = ‘with his gestures,’ see PW. V, 1264; yet *kalanā* itself with this meaning has been put in PWK. II, s. v. under 3 c.) on no other authority but this one and conjectural instance. Further *pramada-manthanārambha* seems suspect. It would be a very uncommon metaphor to employ *manthana*, the well-known term for „churning”, to express the idea of agitation applied to something like a „voice agitated by the workings of joy” (T II, 365). Both difficulties are removed in D, where we read:

*tataḥ su sakalān samam sapadi mantriṇah prāpya tān  
dṛīcā ku litayā girā pramadamantharārambhayā |  
nareçvara-suto 'dhika-pranayam ekam ekam muhur  
dadarça parisasvaje tad anu sambabhāsye kṛti ||*

In translating this stanza there must be taken account of the figure *yathāsamkhya* which connects the three instrumentals in the 2<sup>d</sup> pāda with the verbs in the 4<sup>th</sup> one and which may have been purposely employed to harmonize with the act described of embracing one after another (*ekam ekam*). Therefore, I think T’s translation must be modified in this manner: „Then the prince, having recovered all those ministers at the same instant, looked at them with his eyes, embraced them with impetuosity and then spoke to them with a faltering voice, owing to the emotion of his exceeding love; so he saluted them one by one, again and again, happy by his success.”

**101, 278** A bad orthography misled Prof. Brockhaus, it seems, when he put into his text *abjeṣu çāliṣu* — in T’s translation (II, 380) „the beautiful lotuses,” but *çālin* = ‘beautiful’ would be hardly defensible in this connection! D, editing *abjeṣu sāliṣu* „the lotuses with their bees,” has preserved the genuine word, which is both in accordance with *phullāsu valliṣu*, its parallel in the preceding link of this chain of absolute locatives, and necessary, since it is the humming of the bees but

no sound proper to the lotuses, that is represented to utter the phrase expressed in this cloka.

290 The awful prison, into which Sundarasena and his companion were thrown by the Çabarās is thus described (T II, 381): „The prison was full of multitudes of vermin, filthy with cobwebs, and it was evident that snakes frequented it, as they had dropped there the skins, that clung to their throats etc.” What is said about the snakes, is somewhat shorter in the original which, in Br., has this form: *súcyamánáhi-sancáre nirmokair galalambibhiḥ*, and nothing is stated about the dropping of the skins. If we interpret this half-cloka as philologists, we can draw from it only this meaning: ‘frequency of snakes was betrayed by the snake-skins that clung to (their) throats.’ Of course, this is in fact almost nonsense. D’s text is more satisfactory. For *galalambibhiḥ* it has *gar talambibhiḥ*. That the prison was haunted by serpents was to be inferred from the snake-skins that clung to the *holes* (in its walls).

358 Sundarasena, after many adventures, has been reunited with his beloved Mandāravatī, and from the residence of his father’s vassal, where he dwells, he despatches a messenger with a letter to his old father to announce him that happy news. The messenger arrives just in time; for Mahāsena and his wife were preparing to enter the fire, and his oral affirmation that Sundarasena is alive and will soon come back to his parents changes their despair into joy. Then he delivers his letter:

*ity udīrya ca tasyātra rājñāḥ pādāntike nyadhat  
lekham sa Bhīllabhūpālalekhhārō harañ cuçam.*

So D, whose text restores the genuine wording. Br. has *rahāḥ çuciḥ*, a corruption which embarrassed Tawney who made of *rahāḥ* the best he could (II, 384) and pretermitted *çuciḥ*. That the messenger spoke his comforting words not in secrecy, but aloud, is plain from the sequel (cl. 359) „then all the people there, being delighted, raised a shout of joy”.

102, 29

Br. *Kirāta-rājena tathā báliça-brahmacáriṇā*

D *Kirātarājena tathā bāla sābrahmacáriṇā.*

That D is right, not Br., is plain by the comparison of 70, 19, where it is narrated that the king of the Kirātas had been a fellow-student of Mṛgāñkadatta (*sabrahmacári*

- vidyāśu sa ca bālasuhṛṇ mama*, says M. ibid.). T (II, 389, line 1) was deceived by Br.'s text.
- 63 T II, 390 — see his note — follows in his translation one of his MSS which has *matsyanyāyabhayodayāt* for the nonsense which is in B's text: *mātsaryāya bhayodayāt*. D reads: *mātsyanyāyabhayād ayam* (viz. *rājaçabdah*).
- 113 In Br. the first word: *yuktān* is suspect. T (II, 393) renders it with „assembled”, he construes it with *nṛipatīn* in the 4<sup>th</sup> pāda, and translates ‘those assembled kings’. But nobody, I suppose, would translate this from English into Sanskrit by *tān nṛpatīn yuktān*. Either Brockhaus found a bad reading in his MSS or misread the good one. D has *m u k t ā mrgamadair* etc. Durgapiçāca honoured his royal guests with *pearls*, musk etc.
- 103, 43 In Br. this çloka is made up of a sentence without main predicate; *pravicya* and *tarubaddhāçvāḥ* are predicative attributes of *Mṛgāñkadattāḥ*, neither of them can be the predicate. D restores the predicate lost in Br. It has *Gauryāgārāçramām gatah* (went to the sanctuary of Gaurī) whereas Br. reads *Gaury-āgáryāçramāgratah* (in the front of the s. of G.).
- 109 Here D replaces *asādhyena*, the first word of the çloka in Br. by *açāthya n a* and thus renders to the words of Çrutadhi their full weight. For it is for this reason that Çrutadhi advises Mṛgāñkadatta to act upon the invitation of Karmasena, because „it cannot be with an insidious purpose, that he sent you this message; otherwise how would a powerful prince like that, when his daughter had been carried off, give up fighting, and go home?” Cp. T II, 402, who paraphrases *asādhyena* by „because he saw no other way out of the difficulty”, but I scarcely believe that *asādhyena* can be used as equivalent to *asādhyatāyā*.
- 104, 88 In the description of the lake Çāṅkhahrrada, where it is developed how charming this lake was by the scents and perfumes imparted to its waves from the women who bathed in it, D's text:
- vicihastaiḥ parāmr̥ṣṭajaghana s t a n a maṇḍalam*
- seems more appropriate than Br. *°jaghana-sṭhala-maṇḍalam*.
- D 195 = Br. 196 Better than in Br. where *tādr̥ci yādr̥ci* looks suspect, the composition of the period appears in D. In

D's text the first word of the line is not *tādr̥ci*, but *yādr̥cam* which must be construed with the preceding; the new sentence begins with *yādr̥ci*:

*mayāpi twatkṛte duḥkham anubhūtam suduḥsaham  
yādr̥cam, yādr̥ci caśā prapañcaracanā Vidheḥ  
vakṣyāmi vistarāt tat te etc.*

In T's translation (II, 422) this would make necessary some modifications, in this way: „Hereafter I will tell you of what kind was the intolerable sorrow I, too, have endured for your sake, and how strange a variety of effects in this phenomenal world Fate produces.”

**108, 41** is rendered obscure in Br. owing to one vowel. Dhānavatī, the Vidyādhari, has descended from the sky with her daughter Ajināvatī whom she presents to Naravāhanadatta as his future wife. It is dangerous for you, she adds, to stay there where you are now; we will carry you to another country, where you may dwell in safety for one year, until we come back to perform the marriage.’ Cl. 41 expresses her advice to allow her to bring him to another country; she compares him to the moon in a certain state. In which? B's text:

*na'indul kṣipati kim kālam, parikṣine 'rka-maṇḍale?* seems to hint at the time of an eclipse of the sun. Accordingly, T translates (II, 432): „Does not the moon delay to shine, when the circle of the sun is eclipsed?” But what may be the meaning of this? Firstly, the moonshine is wanting not only at the time of the eclipse of the sun, but also always at the time of the moon's conjunction with the sun. And secondly, if Naravāhanadatta is compared with the moon, it would be consistent to say that the moon does not shine at all when it is obscured itself; there is no reason why the eclipse of the sun should be mentioned. Moreover, *kālam kṣipati* may signify „to delay” but it can never mean „to delay to shine.” So we must infer that B's text must contain some corruption. Indeed, D reads, with a slight variant,

*nendul kṣipati kim kālam parikṣīṇo 'rkamaṇḍale?*

„Does not the moon, when he is in a state of weakness, spend some time within the circle of the sun?” So the comparison receives its full light. Naravāhanadatta, at this point of the story, is in a state of want of power which is analogous to the want of lustre of the moon,

when it is new. As the moon resides with the sun, to await his time and to regain his strength, so N. is to reside at Ārāvasti with king Prasenajit, where he may be said *kālam kṣeptum*. Somadeva apparently plays with the double meaning of *māndala* 1. „circle” and 2. „territory” or „sphere of power” and of *kālam kṣeptum*, which is not only = ‘to delay’ but also ‘to await one’s proper time.’

- 69 Br. *praçānsanti*, D *praçāmsanti*. I think, D is right, not Br. The female apparition, who awakes Naravāhanadatta at night-time to remind him of his beloved Madanamañcukā, speaks thus:

*anyāsaktam praçāmsa n tī patim Madanamañcuke  
hā hatāsi!*

„alas! Madanamañcukā, you are undone! For you praise a husband who is attached to other women.” With *praçāmsanti* cp. 77 *tvadguṇaikalāpinīm*.

- 118 Br.’s text of the line 118 a and b,

*evam uktas tayā patnyā sādhyākālānurodhavān*

demands from the part of the interpreter a so great connivance at grammatical and lexicological incongruencies — *sādhyā* for *sādhayitvā* and supposed to mean „recognising the fact” (T II, 437); *akālānurodhā* is inexplicable for sound exegesis — that D’s variant must necessarily be acknowledged as representing the hand of Somadeva. D reads thus:

*evam uktas tayā patnyā sādh v yā, kālānurodhavān*

*Naravāhanadatto 'tha sāntvayan sa jagāda tām*

„When N. had been thus addressed by his *faithful* wife, he, *taking account of the present circumstances*, said to her by way of calming her.” The italics denote my modification of T’s translation.

- 108, 68 D *āśu*, though it changes the meaning of the hermit’s words but slightly, is preferable to Br. *āçu*, inasmuch as it improves the diction, for it adds to the word indicative of the woman whose clothes are to be carried off the necessary demonstration of the group to which she belongs.

- 82 T, in his note on II, 454, treats of this cloka, which is obviously corrupt in Br., and communicates a much better reading which he found in the Sanskrit College MS (*supra*, p. 63), and which he followed accordingly in his translation. D fully agrees, with the exception of *yāç ca*

in pāda c, for which it has *yac ca*. This is, in fact, the right reading, as will be plain to him who reads the whole cloka as follows:

*sacandrārdhah Civo 'dyāpi Harir yacca sakaustubhah  
tat taylor vedmi kuttanyā gocarāpatane phalam.*

= „That Çiva still retains his crescent and Viṣṇu his kaustubha jewel, *they have to thank for it, I am sure, that they did not fall into the clutches of a kuttanī.*”  
The italics show my modification.

88 Br. *prāptam mām ripunā tadā*, but D *prāstam mām* etc. As Hariçikha has been thrown on the earth, the participle *prāptam* seems to be rather improper to the situation. T (II, 454) translates „when I was seized by my enemy”, rather, I think, to make something not too absurd of it, than because he held *prāpta* for equivalent to „being seized.”

182 Two Vidyādharaś of the party of Naravāhanadatta come into his audience-hall to inform him of the imminent attack of his foe Mandaradeva. At this news, the whole assembly are filled with anger, and the poet describes the tokens of its outburst which showed themselves in the gestures and movements of the different chieftains. So it is said of Amitagati, that his „necklace, rising up on his breast, as he sighed with anger, seemed to say again and again: Rouse thyself, rouse thyself, hero” (T II, 456). In the original text of Br.:

*hārō 'mitagater vakshasy utphullah ḡvasataḥ krudhā,*

“*uttishta 'uttishta, vīra, tvam*” iti *'iva muhur abravit*, the rising up of the necklace is expressed by the participle of the past *utphullah*. But neither a past pteple is here required but a present, nor has *utphulla* another sphere of employment but to signify wide-opened objects, as expanded flowers, eyes etc. For this reason, it is plain that D’s reading *utphalati* = ‘to jump’ cp. PWK IV, 200 s. v. *phal + ut* and the ḷ. λεγ. *utphāla* Kathās. 26, 20.

110, 37 In the words of the pact by which the five princesses oblige themselves, that if one among them were to marry Naravāhanadatta alone, the other four should enter the fire, laying the guilt at the door of her who was wedded (T II, 471), the apodosis (Br.)

*uddicya tām ātmā tyaktavyo 'nyābhīr astv iti*

contains the impossible turn *tyaktavyo 'stu*; I do not wonder at D reading *āçv iti* instead of *astv iti*!

- 75 The second line of this cloka is made up of one of the absolute locatives descriptive of the *mise-en-scène* of Naravāhanadatta's *abhiṣeka*. In Br. it runs thus:

*samgatya tūrya-nādešu mukhareshu dyuyoshitām*  
= „and the assembled cymbals of the heavenly nymphs resounded aloud” (T II, 473). The use of the absoluteative *samgatya* is rather strange in this connection, a participle in <sup>o</sup>*ta* would be more rational. Yet *samgata* would scarcely make a plausible correction. Brockhaus, in fact, may have misread his *Vorlage*. D has *maṅgalya* for *samgatya* and in some kinds of writing मंगल्य and संगत्य are very similar to each other. The whole line in D is:

*maṅgalyatūryanādeśu sugiteśu dyuyositām*  
„at the beautiful songs of the heavenly nymphs accompanied by the auspicious sound of the (heavenly) musical instruments”.

- 130 Brockhaus supposes a lacuna after this cloka (cp. T II, 476), for this reason, I believe, because *āsanne kopakāle 'pi*, the first words of the cloka, seem to prepare the mention of an instant quarrel or a „period of quarrelling”, as T translates it, which, however, is no more spoken of in the sequel. Durgaprasād firstly states that the good reading is *āsann a kopakāle*, and in a note at this cloka (p. 524 of the 2<sup>d</sup> ed.) he remarks that this is to be divided into *āsann akopakāle*. He is right. The meaning is: „The wives of Naravāhanadatta, though there was no opportunity then of being angry, had nevertheless contracted eye-brows and fiery eyes — for they were tipsy”. This is followed by the statement, that they went to another room to take their meal, etc. There is no gap.

- 111, 77 A slight variant or rather the misreading of one akṣara comes to the detriment of the wit of Udayana when, being on the point of leaving Kaučāmbī to become a *vānaprastha*, he rebukes his brother-in-law by a denial of the permission to be his companion in the forest. Feigning to be angry at Gopālaka's disobedience to his order to reign in his place, he exclaims:

*adyaiva tvam anāyatto jāto mithyānuvṛttā me.  
svapadīc eyavamānasya kasyājñām ko hi manyate?*

So D, whereas in Br. the first line ends thus: *mithyānuvṛttaye*. Udayana says: „To day you have become disobedient, *showing your affection to me a sham*; for who cares for the command of one who is falling from his place of power?” I have put italics, where I alter the translation of T.

81 Some lines below, D has *Gopālako vah pāteti* (Br. — *pāti iti*) a better reading, for the future, especially that in °*tr*, „he shall —” is here the tense required.

115, 115 D has *anyānya* for Br. *anyonya*, and so both times, in the first and in the third pāda, confirming T’s conjecture, cp. his note 2 on II, 520.

116, 69 The decisive single combat of Muktāphalaketu and Vidyuddhvaja took place on the 25<sup>th</sup> day of the great battle. In Br’s text it may seem that this duel happened after sunset, for it is edited there:

*pañcavīnce dīne kshīne prāyayoh sainyayor dvayoh  
pradhāna-dvandvayuddhesu pravritteshv atra samgare.*

T (II, 527) renders this cloka: „And at the end of the twenty-fifth day a series of single combats was taking place between the principal warriors of both armies along the greater part of the line of the fight.” I have italicized the translation of both *pañcavīnce dīne kshīne* and *prāyayoh sainyayor dvayoh*. The former may perhaps be accounted for, however improbable it is, but the latter is nothing but a desperate effort to draw forth something acceptable from a phrase which defies sound philological interpretation. In D both difficulties cease to exist, for there we read:

*pañcavīnce dīne kṣinaprāyayoh sainyayor dvayoh* etc.  
= „on the twenty-fifth day, when the two armies were almost exhausted.”

79 Muktāphalaketu, who fights on the side of the Devas, has vanquished and killed the Asura Vidyuddhvaja (76—78). Thereupon the Devas shout for joy and pour showers of flowers on the hero, as usual in such cases. According to Br., they did so from Svarga — *Devāḥ svargād anupadām jagaduh „sādhu sādhu!” iti* — but how could they, being excluded at that time from heaven and waiting for the victory of their champion to be reinstalled in their seats? For this reason, I think, D is right, reading the line quoted as follows: *devāc ca*

*nā dā nupadām* etc. „the Devas, immediately after (hearing) the noise (of the fall of the Asura slain by M.) cried etc.” Cp. Raghuv. 1, 44.

117. 31 Princess Padmāvatī has fallen in love with Muktāphalaketu and has painted her sweetheart. She addresses the picture with a pathetic declaration of her love, beginning thus — in T's translation, II, 530 —: „When thou didst slay the formidable Asura and deliver Indra, how comes it that thou doest not deliver me from my woe, though near me, by speaking to me at any rate?” As T rests on Br.'s text, he must have added out of his own the words „from my woe”, for they do not occur in Br.

*durjayán Asurán hatvá yena 'Indro rakshitas twayá,  
álapamátreṇa sa mām katham árád na rakshasi?*

In D the first line is identical, the second shows a slight variant, which, however, entails a considerable change of meaning:

*álapamátreṇa sa mām katham Mārān na rakṣasi  
„how comes it that thou doest not protect me from the God of Love, were it only by speaking to me?” Māra = Kāma.* Cp. the parallel passages cl. 50: *idam...ceto notsahate kṣaṇam / sthātuṁ vinā tam prāneçam kṣamate na ca Manmathaḥ*, and 65: *strīghnena hanyamānam rakṣasi mām Makaraketunā na katham.*

- 51 Cl. 51, which is part of the utterance of Padmāvatī and is closely connected with the preceding cloka just quoted presents a remarkable variance of reading in the two editions. In Br. its runs thus:

*tam eva hi smarantyā me mano nirvāti tatkshanam,  
dahyante 'ngāni, santápena 'utkrámanti 'iva ca 'ásavah,*  
but in D:

*tam eva hi smarantyā me mano nirvāti na kṣanam, etc.* At the first aspect it will seem that the reading of the one conveys a meaning quite opposite to that of the other. And so it is. The verb *nirvāti* must have that signification of quiet gladness, which it has got in consequence of the contamination of the derivatives of *nis + vr* and *nis + vā*, as known from Pāli *nibbuta* and *nibbāna*; so, I suppose, the meaning 3) of PW s.v. *vā + nis* (VI, 376) gets its genetical basis. According to Br. therefore, the sensation described in the first line is one of pleasure,

but those mentioned in the third and fourth pāda are disagreeable sensations; but in D all are tainted with the guna of *rajas*, so to speak. Not only the absence of the adversative particle, which should be indispensable in Br.'s text, is a formal argument for D, but it is also not consistent that a woman in the situation of Padmāvatī should speak as is thus rendered by T (II, 531): „For when I think of him, my mind is immediately refreshed,” — if translated literally, it should be: „is immediately made quiet and put in calm rejoicing.” The fire of passion, not the calmness of dispassionate joy [*nirvṛti* cp. *nirvṛtā bhava* cl. 62 = „be comforted” apud T (II, 532)] is kindled by her thinking of the man whom she loves vehemently, without knowing anything about his feelings towards herself. D's text conveys a more appropriate sense: „For when I think of him, *my mind is quite troubled*, my limbs burn and my breath seems to leave my body with glowing heat.”

90 Padmāvatī has come near the place, where Muktāphalaketu lies ill. T II, 533 „she said to herself: „Let me see what his illness is, that he is lying here concealed.” The last word renders *channasyaiva* of Br. But as there is no reason at all to say that M. is concealed (*channa*), still less to emphasize this by means of the particle *eva*, it is clear that D's reading *channas thaiva* imports a by far more satisfactory meaning. It is she who spies from her hiding-place the facts and sayings of Muktāphalaketu and his friend.

118, 18 Somadeva relates how Merudhvaja was in the habit of assisting „at the assembly of the gods, on the day of the full moon in the month of Caitra” (T II, 539). As this assembly met once a year, D's reading *vatsarārambhe* for Br.'s *vāsarārambhe* is right. To correct: „for Merudhvaja always went up to Çakra's hall at new year.”

67 It is related how the Daityas fight a battle with an army of men, the Daityas standing in the air and the men on the earth. It need no further proof to demonstrate that not Br. *Daityás tu mánushán svah-stháḥ bhūtalā-sthán babādhire*, but D *Daityás... kha sthā bhūtalasthān* etc. is the genuine reading. The Daityas are represented standing not in the heaven, but between heaven and earth. T (II, 542) rendered the line duly, notwithstanding B's false

reading. I think, Brockhaus misread the akṣara ए, cp. *supra*, p. 69 in fine.

119, 152 foll. In this point of the tale of Muktāphaladhvaja and Padmāvatī their reunion after separation — a commonplace in love-stories of that kind — is being prepared. Muktāphaladhvaja has come to the temple of Čiva, where Padmāvatī, being invisible to him, perceives him. „He entered, and seeing that offerings had been recently placed in front of the god, prince Muktāphaladhvaja said to that companion of his ‘Look my friend, some one has been quite recently worshipping this symbol of the god; surely, that beloved of mine must be somewhere there, and she must have done this worship’” (T II, 557). The variance of both editions is only this that in cl. 152 Br. reads *devo*, D *devam* and in 153 Br. *arcito* ‘*nayā*, D *arcitas tayā*. Yet though the latter variance is rather indifferent, the former necessitates a whole change of construction. For D’s text requires this punctuation:

*so 'pi praviçya devāgram, drṣṭvā pratyagrapūjitatam  
Muktāphaladhvajo devam, vayasyam tam abhāṣata.*

= „Muktāphaladhvaja came in to the god, and seeing that the god had been worshipped recently (by offerings), he said etc.” D presents here a text of more elegant expression and I greatly doubt whether *Muktāphaladhvajo devah* = „prince M.” can be tolerated in this style. As to *praviçya devāgram* cp. 26, 96.

206 Pāda b of this *indravamčā* stanza has been corrected from MSS by T, see his note on II, 560, which correction is confirmed by D; but pāda d, which concludes thus: *vidhivat sa bhūtimān* (Br.) = „that prosperous (king of the Gandharvas).... with due rites” in T’s translation cannot be faultless, since *sa* having already found its place in pāda c (*prādāt sa Muktāphalaketave sutām*) is here superfluous. D reads *vidhivat vibhūtimān*, changing the ‘prosperous’ king into a wealthy one.

120, 67 For *upādānam* (Br.) we find in D *upamānam*. This makes a quite different meaning. Vikramāditya is highly praised and according to Br. it is said of him in T’s translation (II, 567): „Surely his glory furnished the Disposer [= *Vidhi*] with the material out of which he built

up the White Island [*Cvetadvipa*], the Sea of Milk, Mount Kailāsa and the Himālayas." Conceding ever so much to the habits of exaggeration and anachronism, which are proper to Eastern poetry, it is hard to set to the credit of an Indian poet that he should be supposed to make his readers accept such an enormity as the Sea of Milk and the Himālaya created after the pattern of King Vikramāditya's glory. D's text conveys something more reasonable. According to it, the Creator or Dispenser (*Vidhi*) surely used the Cvetadvīpa, the Sea of Milk etc. as his model, when he brought V.'s glory into being.

- 76 In the enumeration of the countries conquered by Vikramaçakti for his master Vikramāditya Br. names these:

*Madhyadeçah sa-Saurāshtrah, sarvā Gāngā ca pūrva-dik*; which implies a very uncommon manner to express „all the eastern region of the Ganges”, as T (II, 567) renders it, or „the whole eastern region, where the Ganges flows” as may rather be meant by *Gāngā pūrvadik* (!) In D there is no question of the Ganges, which in fact does not specially belong to the eastern region of India. These countries subdued are named there:

*Madhyadeçah sa-Saurāshtrah sa-Vaṅgāñgā ca pūrvadik* = „...and the eastern region with the land of Vaṅga and Añga (that is: with Bengal).”

- 83 A slight, but necessary correction of Br. is D's text:  
*ito devājñayā deva gatvāham prāptavān kramāt*.  
 The vocative *deva* is here as properly put as *caiva* (the reading of Br.) is unaccountable and, therefore, passed over by T (II, 568).

- 121, 95 In the course of the ludicrous story of the gamester Thīṇṭhākarāla Somadeva gives vent to this remark, that even gods avoid the contact with an impudent scoundrel, as if they were incapable to withstand him. The çloka which contains this saying, is corrupt in Br.:

*akshina-bhogād vishamād drishtvā tato 'bhayorjitāt  
durjanād vata devā apy açaktā iva bibhyati.*

In T's translation (II, 576) this is rendered somewhat obscurely: „Even gods, you see, like feeble persons, are afraid of a thoroughly self-indulgent [= *akṣinabhogāt*], ruffianly scoundrel [= *viśamād durjanāt*], flushed with impunity [= *abhayorjitat*]”. Here the last epithet is

strange, for his impunity presupposes at all events the consequence of this attitude of the gods, not the source of it; *akṣinabhoga* cannot signify that which T has put for it; and finally *dṛṣṭvā* is not translated at all (for „you see” must be the equivalent, I suppose, of *bata*) and, in fact, in this connection cannot be accounted for. D's edition restores the genuine text:

*akṣinadoṣād viṣamād iṣṭāniṣṭabha yojjhitāt  
durjanād bata devā apy açaktā iva bibhyati*  
= „Even gods, you see, as if they were incapable to withstand him, are afraid of an utterly perverted and wicked scoundrel who fearless does not at all care for good or evil (in his actions).”

155 sq. Thīṇthākarāla, in order to make the king demolish the temple and by this to get free his wife, „secretly buried in a forest outside the city four pitchers containing his wife's ornaments” (T II, 579):

(Br.) *tatra'atavyām catasrīshu nyadhād' dīkṣhu purād vahī  
kāntālāmukāra-kalaçān nivārya caturo bhūvi.*

In T's translation I find no equivalent for *nivārya* nor should I know what meaning to give to this gerund in this context. Instead of it D has *nikhāya*, the very word we are in want of; *nyadhād*... *nikhāya* together = „he buried”. The following half-çloka runs thus in Br.:

*pañcapāñca-mahāratna-sampūrṇam nicakhāna saḥ  
„and one full of sets of the five precious things he....  
buried within the city etc.” So T, who in a note accounts for the term ‘five precious things’. In D, however, we read:*

*pañcamam ca mahāratnasampūrṇam nicakhāna saḥ  
= „and the fifth (pitcher), filled up with precious jewels he buried etc.” That all five pitchers contained rich ornaments and no difference is made between them, is plain from the sequel, see cl. 162, 167 and 171.*

180 (Br.) *tac çarireṇa cet kṛityam lava, nirlocya tad, nṛipa,  
adyaiva 'etad drutam devakulam bhūmi-samam kuru!*  
„So, if you care for your body's weal, my sovereign, take this into consideration and this very day quickly level this temple with the earth” (T II, 580). For *nirlocya* D has *nirlothya*, a reading more appropriate

to the facts. How can there be time for consideration, if the temple should be demolished this very day? Thīnṭhākārāla says: „If you desire to live, demolish the temple and level it with the earth quickly, even this very day.” *Nirloṭhayati* „to demolish” is also used by Somadeva 76, 30 *nirloṭhya mathikām*, answering to T II 244 „remove this hut and —.”

- 122, 21** Br. *sa dvya-ahena try-ahena 'asmai rájñe prábhrita-putrikám likhitvá 'anyānyayá rúpa-bhaṅgyá citrakaro dadau.*

It suffices to observe that D reads *dvyahena dvyahena*, to understand that this variance is really an emendation of Br. So both the symmetry of the composition (cp. *anyānyayā* in pāda c) and the rules of grammar concerning the vīpsā have got their due.

- 63** Vikramāditya, so it is related, had a pleasant dream, that in a very beautiful city across the sea he met with a charming lady, the man-hating princess Malayāvatī and married her. When he awoke not perceiving her he grew sad, and time going he became so afflicted that he lost his interest in everything. His door-keeper Bhadrāyudha, having heard in private the secret cause of his sorrow, induces him to paint the whole scene of his dreamed happiness on a canvass. This being done, Bhadrāyudha had a new monastery made and the picture put up there on the wall. „And he directed that in relief houses attached to the monastery, a quantity of food, with pairs of garments and gold, should be given to bards come from distant countries” (T II, 590). The sentence I have placed within signs of quotation is the translation of this cōloka in Br.’s text:

*maṭhe ca 'atra 'akarod dūra-deçāgantuka-vandinám  
satreshv anna-samāhāram sa-vastrayuga-kāñcanam.*

In D it is not „relief-houses” from which he orders to take the presents destined to the bards, but one such a building; on the other hand, the food is qualified to be delicate, having the six (required) flavours. The pāda c reads in D: *sattre ṣadrasam āhāram.*

- 123, 196** The boatmen, bribed by the old brahman, push the boat where Keçata was into a place of the river where the current ran strong and, swimming themselves ashore, leave him alone to be carried to the sea. His reaching the sea is narrated in this manner in Br. :

*Keçatas tu sanauko 'pi nadyā kritottaraṅgayaś  
kṣipto 'mbudhau vātavaçat*

= „But K. was carried with the boat, by the river which was lashed into waves by the wind, into the sea” (T II, 603). D has:

*Keçatas tu sanauko 'pi nadyā hr̥tvottaraṅgayaś etc.  
„K. carried away with the boat by the river which ran with high waves by the wind, was pushed into the sea.”*

## CHAPTER III.

### CONJECTURAL CRITICISM.

It has been sufficiently proved, I think, in the Chapters I and II that the edition of Durgaprasād marks a considerable progress. We are filled with gratefulness towards that *upakārin*, whose labours contributed so much to the better understanding of the important text on which he bestowed his care; and Tawney must feel somewhat sorry, I think, that D's edition was not out at the time when he made his translation. Nevertheless, as has also been stated above, it is no critical edition. Though the tradition of the text is upon the whole a good one, so that the number of troublesome or difficult passages owing to corruption and depravation of the author's words is comparatively small, yet such puzzles are not wanting altogether. In such cases the absence of an apparatus criticus makes itself painfully felt. The actual state of what is really found in manuscripts is hidden in a dark *terra incognita*. The only and scanty light that sparingly illuminates small spots of it is emitted by the apparatus of Tawney in those cases where his translation is not based on Br.'s text but on different readings of the manuscripts at his disposal. It is something encouraging that his corrections of that kind often confirm conjectural emendations previously proposed by scholars.

For it is a matter of course that, considering at one side our ignorance of the *lectionis varietas* in the manuscripts, at the other the insufficient *ἐξιπτιστία* of Br., conjectural criticism is sometimes by necessity to be resorted to. Some competent Sanskritists whom some reason or other caused to attend more closely to the outer form and the elocution of the „Ocean of the Streams of Tales”, did good work in that direction. First of all BOEHTLINGK was obliged to ponder Br.'s text for the wants of his Dictionary, and TAWNEY had to fulfil this task as a cautious and judicious translator. Both proposed many conjectures *de suo*, among which excellent corrections. After the appearance of Br.'s volume III (lamb.

IX—XVIII) KERN published a paper in the *Journal of the Roy. As. Society*, 1868, containing a list of conjectural emendations.

A very great number of them are incorporated in D's text. I dare not say, that they have found their way thither. I hold it for more likely that they happened to agree with the readings of his new manuscripts and from thence passed into his text. However this may be, the good right and the utility of conjectural criticism as *ultimum remedium* is once more attested.

Boehtlingk's corrections are dispersed in the Petropolitan Dictionary; for this reason I give some fuller indication of those which agree with D's text, as far as I have noted them. At 55, 165 *çūrpākarnāḥ* for *çūryā°*; 56, 247 *sabhya* for *satya*; 62, 188 *anokaha* for *anau°*; 68, 11 *udghātāt* for *udvā°*; 68, 37 *sanvara* for *çānvara*; 72, 20 *vārdhaka* for *vāraka*; 80, 30 *sāmyātrikaiḥ* for *sam°*; 98, 5 *māṇḍalikāḥ* for *ma°*; 103, 30 *paramparām* for *parasp.°*; 118, 112 and 120, 25 *dhiṣṇya* for *dhiṣṭha* and *adhiṣṭha* (sic); 120, 39 *vaiṣamyataḥ* for *vaiçasyataḥ*; 120, 123 *gāndharva* for *Gandharva*; 122, 67 *paurastya* for *paula°*.

Conjectures of Tawney confirmed by D are found: 6, 19, 12, 108, 13, 147, 15, 1, 20, 122, 35, 129, 68, 55, 70, 100; 123, 72, 366, 73, 134, 78, 23, 87, 14, 92, 86, 93, 67, 94, 106, 115, 115, 122, 139, 123, 294.

Conjectures of Kern similarly confirmed: 5, 103, 56, 70, 57, 66, 60, 15, 63, 185, 64, 218, 66, 35, 72, 86, 81, 102, 86, 111, 90, 33, 94, 119, 101, 31; 186, 102, 113, 103, 64; 93, 104, 160, 107, 25; 30; 38, 112, 161, 113, 18, 117, 46, 120, 62, 121, 107, 122, 8, 123, 158, 124, 128.

Sometimes, but rarely, conjectural emendations not confirmed by D agree with one or more of Tawney's MSS., e. g. Kern's proposal as to 114, 113.

Pandit Mookerjea mended 55, 184 (see T I, 546), which emendation has been confirmed by D. Similarly that of an anonymous scholar as to 29, 150 (*'vati* for *bahiḥ*, vid. supra, p. 109).

The following striking corrections are not warranted by D's text. Of Tawney with respect to 22, 238, 24, 184 (185), 25, 117; 216, 45, 167, 47, 117; of Kern as to 52, 189, 65, 218, 106, 178; of Boehtlingk as to 73, 240 (*cīrī* for *cīra*, cp. 87, 32 where the same correction agrees with D); 75, 76 (*asthāt* for *āsthāt*). Yet I would not a moment hesitate to take them up into the text, if ever I were to perform a critical edition of the Kathāsaritsāgara.

Now I proceed to some proposals of conjectural criticism for my own part. Except one passage, treated in Ch. II (*supra*, p. 120),

where I could not avoid it for a practical reason, I have hitherto abstained from bringing forth my own guesses about corruptions of the text without the support of manuscript readings. In this way the conjectural proposals after the publication of D will stay apart from those made before that time on the sole text of Br.

6, 108 I begin with correcting a slight error in a name. In tar. 6, 108 *Devākṛtam tad udyānam* must be changed into *Devākṛtim* etc., cp. ibid. 72 *Devākṛtir iti khyātam udyānam* etc.

111 In this çloka both Br. and D have *jahnuh*, an impossible form. Brockhaus translates this perfect by „schlugen (auf ihn) zu”, hence Tawney likewise „pelted him vigorously” (I, 37), as if it were *jaghnuh*. I read *ja hr u h*; this verb agrees better, I suppose, with the adjectives qualifying its subject. The bathing wives „with bodies the proportions of which were revealed by their clinging garments” incited the mind of their husband to lovesport, *jahruh*.... *tam aīganūh* = ‘mulieres eum ceperunt.’

119 Some lines below it is related how the king was wholly abashed at the manifestation of his ignorance of Sanskrit appearing by his misunderstanding the words of the queen: „modakair deva paritādaya mām.” „The king was at once overpowered with secret shame” (*lajjākrānto jhaṭity abhūt* cl. 118). Cl. 119 thus proceeds:

*parityaktajalakrido vītararpaça tatkṣanam  
jātāvamāno nirlakṣah prāviçan nijamandaram,*

so D. In Br. is edited *nirlakṣyah*, LANMAN has adopted this reading in his *Reader*, 50<sup>14</sup>. But neither *nirlakṣah* nor *nirlakṣyah* seem to represent the genuine word. If we admit of its correctness, we have to comply with such an  $\ddot{\alpha}\tau\alpha\xi$   $\epsilon\pi\mu\acute{e}vov$  as is scarcely consistent with the general laws of structure of Sanskrit words. There does not exist such a verb as *nirlakṣayati*, if it existed, it would not at any rate mean „to avoid the sight.” On the other hand, analysing *nirlakṣya* (or  $^{\circ}kṣa$ ) = „where the *lakṣya* is wanting” cannot account for the translation neither of Br., who makes the king return to his palace, „um von Niemandem gesehen zu werden,” nor for that of T., who renders the conclusion of this çloka in this manner: „and immediately entered his own palace unperceived.” The simplest correction would be to change *nirlakṣah* into *vilakṣah*. But it

seems improbable that an as common word as *vilakṣa* should have been altered. If we correct: *nirlakṣmī*, all will be right. *Lakṣmī* has often the meaning of „brilliancy, lustre” in one's outer appearance (cp. APTE's Dict., s. v. 4°); *nirlakṣmī* is the same as the more common word *nisprabha*. The king, being abashed and put to shame, was in low spirits and in a dejected state of mind; this he showed by his perplexed countenance. Cp. the parallel places *Divyāvadāna* 633<sup>25</sup> and *Avadānaçataka*, I, 48<sup>10</sup> where *niṣpratibhāna* is used of persons, vanquished in disputation.

- 9, 77** For *vipanne pannage pūrvam* I read *v. p. pūrve*. The mountaineer says to Udayana: „I am a poor man, and I always maintain myself by exhibiting snakes [*jīvāmi bhujagam khelayan sadā*]. The snake I previously had having died, I.... finding this one.... captured him [*ayam.... mayā labdhah*]” (T I, 55). Now as the phrase ‘the snake I previously had’ corresponds to *pannagaḥ pūrvah*, not *pūrvam*, it follows that *pūrvam* is a corrupt reading and must be corrected into *pūrve*.

- 10, 159** The hunter who finds Cridatta and tells him that his wife whom he had lost is safe and stays at Nāgasthala in the house of an old brahman, concludes his message with this cloka, which is edited (in both Br. and D) as follows:

*tataç cāham ihāyāto buddhvā tvannāma tanmukhāt  
tām anvesṭum tato gaccha cīghram Nāgasthalam prati.*

T (I, 64) renders the second line thus: „Therefore you had better go quickly to N. to search for her.” But how can Cridatta be urged to search for his wife, when he has been just before informed of the place, where she is. The right reading is, of course, *tvām anvesṭum*, with punctuation after these words, for it is *aham ihāgātah* that has *tvām anvesṭum* for its complement. The hunter says: „having learnt your name from her lips, I came here to search after you. Therefore, go quickly to N.”

- 11, 77** *tataḥ kālena jātāsyā rājñāḥ kanyā tu tanvy atha.*  
The particle *tu* is here not required and inconvenient. Correct: *sutany* *atha* = ‘a very delicate daughter’ or ‘a beautiful daughter’.

- 13, 196** Vāsavadattā leaves her uneasiness at her having left stealthily the paternal home with her lover, king Udayana,

being moved by the lovely tale narrated by Vasantaka about the adventures of the faithful wife Devasmitā. These are the contents of this cārdūlavikrīdita stanza, the third and fourth pādas of which are thus edited:

*tallajjāsadanam vidhāya vidadhe Vatsevare bhartari  
prākpraudhaprāyanāvabaddham api tad bhaktyekatānam manah.*

The subject of the passive perf. *vidadhe* is *Vāsavadattayā* in the second pāda. Tawney has well caught, I think, the purport of the first part of pāda c), which Brockhaus must have considered so difficult as to overlook it wholly in his translation. He translates: „she got over the feeling of shame [= *tallajjās. vidhāya*] at having recently left her father's house [= *navaparityakte pitur vecmani* in pāda b)]”. Apparently he does not take *sadanam* = ‘Sitz’, as is done PW VII, 603 s. v. *sadana* 1), but he will claim for it the meaning 3) ‘Erschlaffung’, as I do. Yet, this being the case, its connection with *vidhāya* does not make a proper sense. Not *vidhāya* but *vihāya* must be the right reading; *tallajjāsadanam vihāya* answers to Latin *hujus pudoris languore relictio*.

- 14, 15      The nuptials of Udayana and Vāsavadattā are come to an end, and U. with his wife go back to Kauçāmbī: *sa pratasthe tato devyā saha.... svapurīm prati*. After two or three days *viṣayam tam avāpya sah* etc. Correct *viṣayam svam*, for he arrived in his own territory.
- 100      Both Br. and D have *gacchatĀvantikām brūtha*. For *brūtha* to restore *brūt.*, it is an imperative.

- 17, 72      I change *pramodena* into *pramādena*. Somaprabhā, that wondrous girl, who spoke immediately after birth, had told her father, he must not marry her to anybody; accordingly the father „concealed her in his house”, and in this manner she grew up hidden from everybody. But, so relates our tale-teller, once it happened that on the festival of spring she looked down from the top of her house. That she did so *pramādena* ‘by some imprudence (of her wardens)’ is something essential which cannot be missing; *pramodena*, which denotes that „she looked on out of gladness”, is to no purpose. Even in the parallel extract in Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, however shortened, the accidental character of the fact is indicated; see p. 80, cl. 139 *tam Ćakrotsavayātrāyām daivād vātāyanasthitām / Guhasenāsuto pacyat.*

156 Yaugandharāyaṇa counsels his master to return to Kauçāmbī, „for we know that there is nothing to be feared from the king of Magadha, even though he has been deceived. For he has been completely gained over by means of the negotiation termed ‘Giving of a daughter’.” (T I, 123). Here the sentence „he has been gained over” is the translation of *samādhitah* in Br., an impossible form, explained in PW, VII, 102 as an *ἄπ. εἰπ.* = *samdhita*. D reads *sa bādhitah* (= „he has been checked”). The true reading is, of course, *sa sādhitah*, that expresses nearly the same as T’s „he has been gained over”; the whole line runs thus:

*kanyāsambandhanāmnā hi sāmnā samyak sa sādhitah.*

21, 96 It is almost superfluous to observe that the avagraha in both editions should disappear; *sa rājaputro bheje parām̄ c̄riyam*. Cp. *supra* p. 92 in fine.

24, 106 I read the cloka thus:

*tāvac ca sa dvitiyo 'sya sakhnā cāramukhena tat vijñāya Mādhavo 'py eva m̄ nagarim̄ praviveça tām.*

The edited text has *tam* and *etannagarim̄*.

25, 88 Both Br. and D edit this cloka as follows:

*rātrau ca tatra suptesu sarvesv adhigatādhvanū grāntesv āstirñaparnādipānthaçayyāniśadiṣu.*

Here I cannot account for *adhigatādhvan* as a designation of people who have travelled the whole day and are now fatigued, as is required by the context; T (I, 209) translates: „And at night, while all were asleep, wearied with their long journey etc.” *Adhigatādhvan* does not suit this meaning, it ought to denote rather ‘one who has found his way.’ I propose to correct: *sarvesv api gatādhvāsu* = „while all travellers without exception, were asleep”; *gatādhvan* is here as appropriate a word to signify people at rest after travelling, as *adhvaga* and *adhvagacchan* (Jātakamālā, VI, 27) to signify travellers on the road.

247 I think *tam* at the end of the 2<sup>d</sup> pāda is to be corrected into *tat*; *sarovaram* is a neuter always and everywhere. Cp. PW and PWK s.v.

26, 142 D = 140 Br. The sons of Satyavrata, having laid hold on Çaktideva, are going to make an expiatory offering of him to Durgā, since he had occasioned the death of their father. They say:

*tad esa Caṇḍikādevyāḥ purastāt pitṛghātakah  
asmābhīr upahartavyāḥ ḡvāḥ prabhāte paçūkṛtaḥ.*

So must be read and not *upahantavyāḥ*, as edited. There is no room here for the gerundive of *han* + *upa*, which, if existing, must mean ‘to be touched, to be hurted’; on the other hand *upahartavya* is the proper word required. Cp. 6, 79 *lokāḥ paçūpahāreṇa priñāti varadām imām*; 18, 161 *ātmopahāreṇa priñāmi bhavatīm aham*; 22, 64 D *tatrāham upahārartham upanītaḥ* etc.; 53, 137 *tatra prabodhya* (viz. *Viravarāḥ*) *bhāryāyai. . . . ḡaçānisa saḥ / svaputram upahartavyam rājārthe vacanād Bhuvāḥ*; Br̄hatk. tar. 2, 113 *Bhillair* (so to read) *Durgopahārāya nibaddho bāhuçrṇkhalaiḥ*. — Cancel *upahantavya* in PW and PWK.

226 D = 224 Br. Both editions have

*taṁ ca kṛṣṭam puras tyaktvā Devadattam tam abhyadhāt.*

I think it must be *punaḥ*, not *puras*. T (I, 230) translates: (She, after cleaving her body and taking out the child) „flung it down before him and said”, but how can the sole *puras* convey the meaning of the two words *puras tasya?* *Punaḥ* signifies that she took the child out and immediately after again abandoned it.

27, 148 The minister Amaragupta, counselling his lord Vikramasiṅha to go a hunting, calls hunting a fine and useful sport, yet it ought no to be practised with excess. Pāda a of the cloka where this is stated, is edited thus: *na cāti te niṣevyante*. As no plural noun immediately precedes to which to refer the subject *te*, T (I, 243) accepts *te* as meaning the *mrgā duṣṭāḥ*, named in pāda a of 147, and translates: „but wild animals should not be too unremittingly pursued.” A forced interpretation, also with respect to *niṣevyante*. I hold the words for slightly corrupt and emend them in this way: *na cāti sa niṣevyas te* = „yet, you should not love that (hunting-sport, *ākhetā*, named immediately before in 147 d) too much.”

29, 91 Kīrtisenā who during the absence of her husband is exposed to the vexations and the ill treatment of her mother-in-law reflects within herself, what I put here with the words of the translator (T I, 261): „My husband is rich, I was born in a good family, I am fortunately endowed and virtuous, nevertheless I suffer such calamity, thanks to my mother-in-law.” By the bye I remark that the words „I am fortunately endowed” answer to

*saubhāgyam* and express that she possessed beauty and other qualities apt to captivate a husband. The conclusion „thanks to my mother-in-law” is a clever rendering of *çvaçrūprasādāt* of the original. Yet *prasāda*, being not used as our „thanks to” as a vox media indicative of any cause, even of mishap, is wholly out of place here. And the nature of the context forbids us to explain *çvaçrūprasādāt* as an ironical utterance = „by the favour [that is: ill-favour] of my mother-in-law”. The word is doubtless depraved. I guess the genuine ablative may be easily restored and read the çloka as follows:

*ādhyah patih kule janma saubhāgyam sādhuvrttatā  
tad apy aho mama çvaçrvapasada idṛci vipat.*

„ . . . nevertheless I suffer such calamity because of that accursed mother-in-law.” For *apasada* with this meaning, see the instances quoted by APTE, *Sanskrit-English Dict.*, s. v. and also Daçakumāracarita, Uttarakh., 4<sup>th</sup> Ucchvāsa (p. 131 ed. Tāran.) *kva yāsi kuñjarāpasada.*

32, 135 D = 136 Br. The structure of the period which makes up this çloka is somewhat disturbed; the clause *yat suhṛn me 'sti nāpitah* is not accounted for satisfactorily from a grammatical point of view, whether it should be construed with the preceding sentence, or with the following. I think, *yat suhṛt* should be corrected into *yah suhṛt*, and I read the çloka thus:

*ekas tatrābhypāyah syāt: yah suhṛn me 'sti nāpitah  
idrgvijñānakuçalah, sa cet kuryād ihodyamam.*

144 D = 145 Br. What may be the force of *param*, the last word of the first line of this çloka? The female ascetic deliberates with her friend, the barber, about some means to remove queen Kadalīgarbhā from king Dr̥ḍhavarman, her husband, who is much attached to her. The barber dissuades to use violence; „therefore it is far better”, says he „that she should be separated from the king by means of our ingenuity”, etc. (T I, 288). There can be no question of doubting the rightness of this translation. But it is not *param* that means ‘far better,’ but *varam*, and so, I am sure, the edited text is to be mended :

*tasmād buddhibalenaiṣū rājño viçliṣyate varam.*

This, too, is in accordance with the habit of our author of employing *varam* in the way of an adverb, so as to have

almost the nature of our „rather”. Here are some instances: 22, 84 *tad etām upasarpāmi tāvaj jijñāsitum varam / ity ālocya*; 26, 250 *āstām tatraiva bhūyo 'pi pāpah kāpāliko varam* = „let the wicked kāpālika rather remain there still longer”; 39, 50 (Br.) *tad ihaiva varam devi bhūgrham kriyatām iti*; 101, 8 *varam Ujjayinīm yāmi tatra prāpyeta jātu saḥ*; 123, 57 *tad gacchāmi varam pathā / etatpradarçyamānena*. Other instances see PW, VI s. v. *varam*, 2 b.

- 34, 167 I read this çloka with a slight correction, altering *tayāniya* into *tas yā*<sup>o</sup>:

*tatra pārçvam tasyāniya sutām Madanamañcukām  
Kalingasenayā prītyā rajyamānah sa tashivān.*

*Pārçvam* cannot be destitute of the genitive depending on it.

- 212 The words *yathā tathā* at the end of the 2<sup>d</sup> pāda must be interchanged, the meaning being „he conducted himself in such a way [ceṣṭate sma *tathā*] that [*yathā*], though attacked by an emperor, he was not defeated” (T I, 314).

- 37, 165 Tawney translates the line *anubhūtādbhutānekajunmāmutraiva janmani* „having endured more than one [add: ‘wonderful’] birth in this very life” (I, 343). But *anutra janmani* is „in the other life”, the very counterpart of this life (*idam janma*). Somadeva wrote, I am sure, *janmāmutreva janmani* = „having endured many wonderful births, as if in the other world.”

- 38, 111 It is said of the hetaera Madanamālā that she, having lost her sweetheart, determined to die, if in the space of six months he should not return. Her temper of mind, while being in this disposition, is thus described in the edited text (Br. and D.):

*tatas tadripayogārtā jivitam viśavedanām  
deham nispalamāyāsamāhāram caurayātanām  
manyamānā,*

and rendered by T (I, 352) as follows: „. . . . afflicted at his departure, and considering life to be poison-agony, and the body, that fruitless accumulation of delusion, to be merely a punishment for thieving.” We may understand that she, heavy with sorrow, looks on life as anguish caused by poison, but what in the world may account for the strange and absurd opinion, that the body

should be hold for ‘a punishment for thieving’? Besides, though *māyā* (delusion) is the acknowledged cause of the phenomenal world, from the orthodox Vedantic stand-point, such a tenet as *deha = māyāsamāhāra* is unheard of and, if considered well, almost an impossibility for an Indian mind; the *māyā* does not consist of small particules, the sum or *samāhāra* of which makes up a body. Brockhaus was mistaken, when he divided *nishphala-máyá-samáhāram*. He ought to have divided thus: *nispalam āyāsam āhāram*, in three words. And as to *caurayātanām*, I am sure it represents a misread *caiva yātanām*. I restore, accordingly, Somadeva’s genuine cloka in this manner:

*tatas tadviprayogārtā jīvitam viśavedanām  
deham nispalam āyāsam āhāram caiva yātanām  
manyamānā,*

= „....considering life to be poison-agony, the body fruitless toil and food to be a punishment.”

**39, 215** For *rājānam gatam buddhvā savākchalam / sambhāvyaiva*  
I propose.... *sva vākchalam / sambhāvyaiva* = „guessing that the king was gone after knowing her false tongue”; *buddhvā* has the king for its subject, not the queen. T’s translation (I, 366) is to be corrected in this way.

**41, 31** King Cirāyus the long-lived, whose minister was the wise Nāgārjuna (see *supra*, p. 48), has anointed his son Jīvahara *yuvarāja*. When he, rejoiced at his dignity of crown-prince, comes up to his mother, she says to him: „Why do you rejoice without cause, my son, at having obtained this dignity of crown-prince, for this is not a step to the attainment of the kingly dignity, not even by the help of asceticism? For many crown-princes, sons of your father, have died, and not one of them has obtained the throne, they have all inherited disappointment. For Nāgārjuna has given this king an elixir, by the help of which he is now in the eighth century of his age.” These words of the mother, which I transcribe from T (I, 377) = original text **41, 31—33**, offer no difficulty, but for the mention of asceticism. The life and the business of a crown-prince are the very contrary of the life and the occupations of an ascetic. What, then, the *tapas* has to do here? Nothing at all, I think. If the cloka 31 were free from corruption, that *tapas* would cease to be. I surmise, the genuine form of this cloka was:

*yauvarājyam idam prāpya putra hrṣyasi kiṁ mṛṣā?*  
*rājyaprāptyai kramo hy eṣa na kadācana vidyate*  
 = „do not rejoice at your being anointed crown-prince:  
 this is never at all a step to the attaining of the royal  
 dignity;” नकदाचन has been depraved into तपसाचन.

- 44, 57 Sūryaprabha, the future lord of the Vidyādharaś kidnaps many princesses as his wives, thanks to the favour of the Asura Maya. Roaming with his chariot through the air he took Madanasenā from Tāmraliptī, Candrikāvatī from Aparānta, Varuṇasenā from Kāñci, Sulocanā from Lāvā-naka etc. From Tāmraliptī he carried away also a second princess,

*āyayau Tāmraliptīm ca punas tatrāpy apāharat  
 aparām rājatanayām kanyām nāmnā Vilāsinīm.*

Here I have corrected *apāharat* for *upāharat*, as is edited in both Br. and D. Perhaps it was an error of print in Br., thoughtlessly repeated in D. Cp. cl. 63, where the king of Tāmraliptī complains to the father of Sūryaprabhā: *putreṇa tava me pahṛte sute. Supra*, p. 71 we have conversely corrected *apa*° instead of *upa*°. At 48, 34 D has *upakṛtam*, which is preferable to Br. *apakṛtam*.

Another instance of the same confusion is 75, 95. The woman says:

*kiṁ tv aham na sadā tatra gacchāmy apa hṛtāmbarā.  
 kuputraḥ kitavo vastrām dṛṣṭvā hi karate mama.*

Here Br. reads *upahṛtāmbarā*, D *upahatāmbarā*. The fault escaped the attention of Boehltingk, who in his *Chrestomathie*<sup>2</sup> p. 114 (cl. 37) kept the reading of Br., Tawney rightly translates, as if his text had *apahṛta*: „but I never go at present, as I have been deprived of my clothes, for my wicked son, who is a gambler, takes away my clothes, as soon as he sees them.” (II, 236).

- 45, 27 In the answer of Maya, the advocate of Sūryaprabha, to Nārada, Indra’s messenger, Br.’s corrupt text: *yat prāçvamedhākaranām devāvajnām*” *ca jalpati / tad asat* has misled T (I, 415). D much better: *yaç cāçvamedhā*. Read: *y a c cāçvamedhākaranām devāvajnām ca jalpati tad asat* = „and with regards to his (Indra’s) saying about the non-performance of an *açvamedha* (by us) and our contempt of the devas, that is false.”

49, 175 D = 176 Br. For *sāpi tanmukha eva* I think it must be put *sāpi tanmukhen aiva*; *tanmukha eva* cannot be accounted for grammatically, neither as nom. nor as loc., and cp. the preceding cloka *pravrājakamukhena*.

216 „And a wife, [says Gunçarman] who falls in love of her own accord with a man, is sure to be chaste, but if she is given away by her father against her will, she will be like Aśokavatī” (T I, 469). The original text of this sentence, whose meaning is exactly rendered by the words quoted, is thus edited:

*jāyā ca svarasā raktā bhaved avyabhicāriṇī  
avaçā pitṛdattā ca syād Aṣokavatī yathā.*

Here, I suppose, every Sanskritist must be at a loss how to account for *svarasā*. That word must be somehow corrupted, and I think we do not go much amiss by conjecturing the true reading to be *sva vaçā*. The wife got against her will and given by her father — *avaçā pitṛdattā ca* — is contrasted with her who of her own accord comes to her husband, whom she loves — *sva vaçā raktā*.

53, 40 Labdhadatta, a dependent (*kārpātika*) of king Lakṣadatta, had received from his lord a citron filled with jewels. He, however, thinking it a common citron, sold it to some Buddhist mendicant, who visiting the king, presents him with it. Lakṣadatta, recognizing the fruit, asks the mendicant, how he came by it. The first line of cl. 40 contains the question; Br. differs here from D :

Br. *mātulungam kuta idam samlabdham bhavatām iti*  
D *mātulungam kuta idam bhadanta bhavatām iti.*

I prefer the reading of D, but as it is very improbable that the king addresses that ordinary mendicant in so respectful terms as is implied by the plural *bhavatām*, I hold this word for a corruption and conjecture:

*mātulungam kuta idam bhadanta bhanyatām iti*  
= „How did you come by that citron? Tell it me, reverend sir.”

57, 111 foll. These two clokas, in which the rescue of Sundarī from the well and the returning of her lover İçvaravarman are narrated (T II, 7), seem to be badly transmitted in mss. Partly D, partly my own conjecturing may help

to improve the reading. So, I think, Somadeva composed them:

*utkṣiptā mṛtakalpaṇī sā kṛtvātmānāṇi nivedite<sup>1)</sup>  
pratyāga te vanikputra ālāpam čanakair dadau ||  
samāčva stām<sup>2)</sup> samādāya hṛṣṭas tām sānugah priyām  
āgād Iṣvaravarmāsau pratyāvṛtyaiva tadgr̥ham ||*

62, 143 Since it is impossible to construe *yūyam* . . . . . *sarve tiṣṭhantu*, and no other grammatical employment of the imperative is left than to be the predicate of *yūyam*, *tiṣṭhantu* must be a clerical error for *tiṣṭhata*.

63, 59 The water-genius relates how he has been born as such by a fault committed in a previous existence, when being under the vow of the *uposatha* he, though not purposely, had had sexual intercourse with his wife. „When this vow was almost completed” he says, „one of my wives wickedly came and slept in my bed.” (T II, 82). Then happened that which is told in cl. 59 defectively edited in Br. — one syllable is wanting —, in D it is as follows:

*turye tu yāme vismṛtya tadvrate tanniṣe v anam  
nidrāmohāt tayā sākam rataṇi sevitavān aham.*

It is plain that he did not forget *tanniṣevanam* but *tanniṣedhanam*. As to the confusion in mss. between *v* and *dh* see *supra*, p. 69 at the bottom.

65, 81 The meaning of *upakārāṇḍa*, as is edited in Br. and D., must be a mystery to the interpreters of this passage. Somaprabhā has cursed her brother to become a bird with a golden crest, and puts this term to the curse, saying: „When . . . you fall, in your bird-form, into a blind well, and a certain merciful person draws you out, and you do him a service in return, then you shall be released from this curse”. I transcribe the words quoted from T II, 105 and I have italicized the equivalent of *tasya kṛtvopakārāṇḍam* of the edited text, to show that Tawney translated *upakārāṇḍa* as if it were simply *upakāra*. I surmise that the genuine reading is:

*tasya kṛtvopakāraṇī traṇī čāpam etāṇi tarisayasi.*

67, 72 Since there is no species of ruddy goose (*cakravāka*)

<sup>1)</sup> Br. *nivedya tam / pratyāgataṇī vanikputram* *ñ*<sup>o</sup>  
D *niveditam / pratyāgataṇī vanikputram* *ñ*<sup>o</sup>

<sup>2)</sup> So D; Br. *sanāčvastah*

which is styled *niçācakravāka*, and there is made mention in this çloka of the *cakravāka* separated from his *cakra-vāki* „at night” (T II, 129), a very common simile, the edited reading need be corrected into *niçī cakrāhvā-sadr̄ci kāpy avasthā mamābhavat*.

- 71, 11 Mrgāñkadatta has rescued the king of the Bhillas from the peril of drowning, whereupon that prince shows his gratitude by offering him his friendship and assistance in his undertaking, inviting him to enjoy his hospitality with these words (T II, 154): „So do me the favour, my lord, of coming to my palace, since I am your slave.” It is obvious that the original text of this content thus edited:

*tat prasādam kuruvaihi gṛhān bhṛtyasya me prabho*  
must be corrected into . . . *bhṛtyasya te prabho*.

- 105 In the speech, with which king Vimalākara blames the inaction and the want of energy of his son Kainālākara, an instrumental has perchance ousted the legitimate locative from its place. Read the first line of the çloka thus:

*tvayi ca drṣṭā nādyāpi jīgīṣā sukhasaṅginī*  
and translate „up to the present time no longing for conquest has manifested itself in you, a person addicted to pleasures”. The edited text has *tvayā . . . sukhasaṅginā*, as if *drṣṭa* were synonymous with *darçita*.

- 74, 69 I suppose *pragalbha* to be corrupt. We have to expect *pragalbhatām*. The citizens thought: „(But) let Samara-bhaṭa not dare to rob him of the kingdom.” The çloka, therefore, is to be corrected thus:

*mā i vāsyā rājyam Samarabhaṭo hartum pragalbha tām* etc.

- 82, 44 The man who was fastidious about beds, one of the three fastidious brothers, bore a red mark on his side caused by a hair that was found upon examination underneath seven mattresses. This mark qualified in cl. 41 *mudreva kūṭilāruṇyā* is again spoken of in cl. 44, for not *aṅgam*, as has been edited, but *aṅkam* must be meant. It is said that the king was astonished on beholding that mark:

*so 'py ānītasya vīkṣya tat  
tadrūpam tūlikācaṅgasyā n kām rājā visismiye*  
(T II, 273 translates: „when the king saw the state of his body”). Cp. Kṣemendra telling the same tale IX, 2, 362

*çayyācaṅgo 'dhikas tebhyo yo vālenāñkitaś tanau.* In the parallel place of the prose redaction of *Vetālapañcavimśati* edited by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara in 1873 (tale 5, p. 27<sup>12</sup>) likewise: *çayyācaṅcoḥ pr̥ṣṭhe cihnam dṛṣṭvā brūte: „satyam ayam çayyācaṅcuḥ.“*

- 83, 30 Jivadatta, one of the suitors for the hand of Anaṅgarati being asked his name and his profession or art, answers :

*vipro 'ham Jivadattākhyo vijñānaṁ ca mamedrēcam :  
jantūn mytān apy āniya darçayāmy ācu jivataḥ.*

So this çloka is edited. Its meaning is plain, but for *apy āniya*. That T's translation (II, 276) „I can restore to life dead creatures, and exhibit them alive“ is materially right, is out of question. But T did as less understand the words *apy āniya* as I do. I believe they are vitiated and perhaps we would not be far from the truth, if we restored *anuprāṇya*. The *anuprāṇana*, in its most strict acceptance, signifies a certain ceremony in the ritual of the *jātakarma*, the object of which is to vivify the newborn child by inspiring into it successively the five different breaths which constitute life. In a figurative sense it is used in the *Prabodhacandrodaya*, IV (p. 137 of ed. Nirṇayas., 1898) *prāṇāyāmādyanuprāṇanena*. Here, too, the verb *anuprāṇayati* would be apposite to express the idea of ‘restoring to life’ dead people. Cp. *vīçvasya hí prāṇanām jīvanam tué* (RV. 1, 48, 10) „in you (Uṣas) resides that which makes every being breathe and live.“

- 94, 100 The boy of seven years who willingly offers his life to save that of the king and to relieve his poor parents, says to them, when he asks their permission: „permit me to do so, and put an end to your poverty“ (T II, 340). The Sanskrit original of this sentence is vitiated by a grammatical blunder, which I should pass over tacitly, for it seems to be a simple error of print in Br., if not D had the same fault. Of course, it must be  
*tan mām abhyanujāñtam ha tam cāpadam ātmānah;*  
both Br. and D have *hatām*.

- 95, 12      *tato dīneśu yāteśu tīkṣṇasūryāmçusāyakaiḥ  
prosītānām niruddhādhvā gharmakāla iha bhyagāt.*  
The adverb *iha* is out of place. This is so obvious that T (II, 343) omitted it in his translation unconsciously,

methinks. Read: *gharmakāla ivābhyaगात्*; the particle of comparison, though put after *gharmakāluḥ*, logically belongs to *prośitānām niruddhādhvā*. The three following clokas are built up in a similar way; they are descriptive of characteristics of the hot season, each trait being embellished by a comparison denoted by *iva*. This consideration favours the proposed correction.

- 108, 131** The spies who have visited incognito the court of the rival Vidyādhara king Mandaradeva report to Naravāhanadatta the hostile intentions of that monarch and his disdaining utterance about him. On hearing this, „the assembly of N.'s partizans.... were all beside themselves with anger.... The arms of Chitrāngada, frequently waved and extended, seemed with the tinkling of their bracelets to be demanding the signal for combat, etc.” (T II, 456). What is said here of Citrāngada corresponds to this cloka:

*Citrāngadasya bāhū svau vidhūtaprasrtau punah  
amārgatām ivādecaṁ yoddhum valayanihsvanaiḥ.*

Anybody who reads these lines must be stricken by the impossibility of explaining *svau*. This pronoun is not only quite superfluous, but as little as one would say in English: „Citrāngada's own arms frequently waved”, can Somadeva have expressed himself in a similar way. I hold *svau* for corrupt, and suggest that the good reading is *khe*; C. made strong movements with his arms in the air to give vent to his anger. As to the palaeographical ground of this emendation, cp. 106, 110 where Br. has *kheda-chalāt*, but D the right reading *svedacchalāt* (*supra*, p. 69).

- 119, 140** Muktāphaladhvaja says to his friend that the temple of Gaurī, near which they have descended, is the place where he rescued formerly his beloved Padmāvatī from the injury of the Rākṣasīs [116, 27 foll.]. In T's translation (II, 556) his words are: „Here I had my first interview with my beloved, when she had been terrified by the Rākṣasīs, etc.,” the original of which is:

*amutra Rākṣasītrastā pūrvam̄ sambhāvitā mayā.*

But *sambhāvitā mayā* cannot be the equivalent of „I had my first interview with her;” on the other hand no meaning inherent to *sambhāvita* befits the situation. I think *sambhāvita* is a misread *samtāritā*, which being restored

makes the meaning this: „Here I rescued her, when she had been terrified by the Rākṣasīs.”

- 184 Padmāvatī is about to put an end to her hopeless life and deliberates, what means of suicide is the best in her case. The blazing funeral pile, which has consumed the bodies of Muktāphaladhvaja and Mahābuddhi does not like her, since „it is not fitting, that I should enter this fire and be mixed up with strange men. So in this (difficult conjuncture) hanging, which gives no trouble, is my best resource” (T II, 559). I have put within brackets two words added by the translator. The original Sanskrit çloka is this:

*parapūruṣamadhye tu praveṣṭum analē 'tra me  
na yuktam tad anāyāsaḥ pāca evātra me gatiḥ.*

Should hanging be styled by that girl a manner of killing one's self „which gives no trouble?” And even if she thought so, this declaration is not the contrast of what precedes, as it ought to be; for it is *not on account of the trouble* which she fears that she is not willing to throw herself into the fire. In short, *anāyāsaḥ* must be a corrupt reading; the genuine word hidden under the corruption is *a nās t hā yā h*, I think. By restoring it, we get this meaning: „hanging alone is the proper act for me, destitute as I am of hope”.

- 121, 148 Çakra has cursed Kalāvatī and added the term of the curse. She goes back to the earth and weeping „told to Thinthākarāla the curse Indra had pronounced, together with the end he had appointed to it, and how he himself was to blame” (T II, 579). Of the Sanskrit original of the quoted passage, as it is edited,

*itIndraçāpaçāpāntāv etya sācruḥ çāçamsa sā  
tasmai Kalāvatī Thinthākarālāya savācyatam,*

the last word cannot be right. Read: *savācyakam*, an *avyayibhāva* = „with words of blame”.

- 123, 266 B = 265 Br. The wicked servant who had in vain tried to keep the lady whom he had to lead to his master for himself, and now returns to him without her, exculpates himself with a lie. He says: „no sooner did she come out and was seen, than I was seized there by those other men, etc.” (T II, 607). The words quoted represent nearly the meaning of the original text, but

in the editions the conjunctions *yāvat* . . . *tāvat* have interchanged their places. It must be:

*naiva sā niragād yāvad, dṛṣṭas tāvad aham janaiḥ.*  
Br. reads the line thus:

*naiva sā niragāt tāvad dṛṣṭā, yāvad aham janaiḥ*  
D as follows

*naiva sā niragāt tāvad dṛṣṭo yāvad aham janaiḥ.*  
The meaning is: „Before she had come out, other people saw me, those seized me and took away my mule”.

**124, 32** The style of the second line of this cloka would be much improved by correcting

*ko nāma Vikramādityah? sa eva 'ājñām dadāti nah*  
(Br. and likewise D), into

*ko nāma Vikramādityah sa yad ājñām dadāti nah?*

Care has been taken to offer only such emendations to the consideration of competent judges as are evident or almost evident to myself. I have avoided advancing uncertain guesses and vague conceits. Many corrupt places are still waiting the hand that restores them to soundness, in the first place if possible, by the light of duly examined manuscripts, or this failing, by critical acumen. For though, as stated before, the text has been upon the whole preserved tolerably well and *cruces interpretationis* are, therefore, comparatively rare, now and then there exists a strong presumption of depravation being the cause of our want of understanding a given passage. Among others I mention 10, 68. 11, 16. 14, 72. 16, 58. 22, 115<sup>1)</sup>. 37, 102. 44, 107. 53, 88 (tempted without success by Kern). 55, 173. 57, 17. 72, 69. 102, 111. 112, 153.

In the course of these researches comparison of Somadeva's text with the Br̥hma. has sometimes proved a useful instrument in both exegetical and critical respect. I am persuaded that a thorough and close examination of both works in concordance with each other, as Mańkowski and Hertel have done already for the Pañcatantra portion, must bear good fruit.

I will give a fair sample of what I mean with that help. It is worth while to deal with it more fully.

<sup>1)</sup> Perhaps to read *kim vyājenārjuke jane?* [= *vyājena + rjuke Jane*]. The reading of the editions *vyājenārjave Jane* implies an impossibility. It is inadmissible to take *arjava* (uprightness) with the meaning of *rju* 'upright'. Cp. also t. 24, 79.

In Somadeva's t. 72 a remarkable story is told which may be called the very different Indian fashion of the legend of Daedalus and Icarus. The Sanskrit text that contains it, is edited as follows by Br.:

Âśid Môlâdharo nôma piurvam brâhmaṇaputrakah.  
 so 'paçyad ekadâ Siddha-kumâram vyoma-gâminam. 278.  
 tat-spardhayâ tñamayân pakshân âbadhya párçvayoh,  
 utplutya 'utplutya gagane gaty-abhyâsam açikshata. 279.  
 pratyaham cû talhâ kurvan pariçramam apârthakam  
 dadriçे sa kumâreñâ kadâcid vyoma-câriñâ. 280.  
 „dhairyâ-yuktah pariçramyan dushprâpe 'rthe 'pi sodyamah  
 „bâlo 'yam anukampyo me, mama hy esha parigrahah,” 281  
 iti samcitya tushñena nîtvâ tena svâ-çaktitah  
 skandhena, dvijaputro 'sâv âtmâno 'nucarâk kritah. 282.

Tawney, since he had no other instrument for interpretation at his disposal but the text as transcribed here, acquitted himself well of his task by translating it as follows:

„Once on a time there was a young Brâhmaṇ of the name of Málâdhara: he beheld one day a prince of the Siddhas flying through the air. Wishing to rival him, he fastened to his sides wings of grass, and continually leaping up, he tried to learn the art of flying in the air. And as he continued to make this useless attempt every day, he was at last seen by the prince while he was roaming through the air. And the prince thought: „I ought to take pity on this boy who shews spirit in struggling earnestly to attain an impossible object, for it is my business to patronize such.” Thereupon, being pleased, he took the Brâhmaṇ boy, by his magic power, on his shoulder and made him one of his followers.” (T II, 184).

Here is its parallel in Brâhmk. p. 258:

çicur Mâlâdharo nâma brâhmaṇo Dakṣinâpathe  
 dadarça nabhasñ yântam javñt Siddhakumârakam. IX, 1, 532  
 tam dr̄ştvâ tâlapakṣâbhyan krtvâtmânam pariškratam  
 ñkâce gamanâbhysam vyadhâd utsâhanirbharaḥ. 533  
 tato yadrcchayâ yâto Bhagavân varado Guhaḥ  
 tam dr̄ştvâ bâlakṛpayâ cakâra vyomagâminam. 534

Leaving aside a few slight differences between both narratives, with Kṣemendra it is not the young Siddha-prince who pities the energetical fantastical man, but the mighty son of Çiva himself. And considering more closely the tale told, it is much more likely that a god made him one of his followers than a simple *Siddhakumâraḥ*, who for the rest may rather represent „some young Siddha”

— Kṣ. names him *Siddhakumārakam* — than a „prince of the Siddhas.” It is now plain that Brockhaus misunderstood the word *kumāreṇa* cl. 280. It denotes not „that prince of Siddhas” but Kumāra = Guha = Skanda, the wargod. And if we compare also D’s edition of the Kathāsaritsāgara, it appears that Br. in cl. 282 by mistake wrote *skandhena* [T’s „upon his shoulder”] for *Skandena*, as he will have found in his MSS. So it is plain that Somadeva and Kṣemendra fully agree as to the main fact, that it was Skanda who took up the undertaking brahman to his dominions and made him his follower. T’s translation is to be altered accordingly.

## CHAPTER IV.

### METRORUM CONSPECTUS.

Somadeva was a skilled metrician. He handles the most various metres with facility and does not seem to have had great trouble to harmonize his elocution with the severe exigencies of the different kinds of versified style. As a rule he writes with the same fluency and lucidity, whether he uses the ordinary *anuṣṭubh* çloka or composes çikhariñī and çārdūlavikrīdita stanzas. It is the old custom of Indian artful narrative poetry to change the metre in the last verses of the cantos. Somadeva, who in accordance with his predecessor Kṣemendra composed the bulk of his poem in ordinary çlokas and made that metre the main metrical form of each of the 124 *taraṅgas* of his *sāgara* of tales — the popular style and the literary character of the fairy stories being little adapted to more severe and more refined metrical schemes for the composition of whole cantos, as is the case in the *Buddhacarita* and the classical epics of Kālidāsa, Māgha and others — affords a comparatively large room to that metrical variety of the conclusions. In the first lambakas he observed some restraint, but gradually he must have allowed himself to indulge freely into his talent of displaying the richness of his descriptive and representing power in an elegant variety of metres. He does so especially in the last canto of each lambaka. The ninth lambaka ends with thirteen, the seventh with thirty-four, the long twelfth even with forty-nine such free stanzas.

As I am not aware of a conspectus metrorum of the *Kathāsa-*  
*rītsāgara* already existing, and this may be a useful instrument for  
further research, I subjoin it here in the way of an appendix to  
these Studies<sup>1)</sup>.

---

<sup>1)</sup> I follow D's text for the numbers of the verses in each *taraṅga*. Those of Br. agree with them, if the contrary is not stated.

## GANACCHANDAS.

*Āryā: a.) pathyā:*

1, 63—65. 3, 64; 75—78. 4, 135. 8, 35—37. 11, 81—83.  
 12, 193. 14, 88. 16, 122. 18, 406. 21, 147. 22, 255—258. 23,  
 91. 24, 230. 25, 292; 293. 26, 94; 273—278 (271—276<sup>1</sup>)); 286  
 (284). 27, 211. 34, 251; 252; 265. 35, 163; 164. 36, 135. 37,  
 238; 239; 244. 38, 156; 157. 39, 246. 43, 245; 252\*); 258;  
 259; 262. 44, 140; 186 (187). 45, 370; 371. 50, 207 (208);  
 210 (211). 51, 220—225. 52, 405; 406. 53, 32; 194. 54, 240.  
 55, 235—237; 239. 56, 338 (339), repeated 358 (359); 417—419  
 (418—420); 421—423 (422—424). 58, 141. 59, 171. 61, 329.  
 64, 162; 163. 65, 255; 256. 66, 192. 67, 114. 68, 72; 73.  
 70, 181. 71, 70, repeated 99; 304. 74, 326. 76, 41. 77, 93—95.  
 80, 54. 82, 48; 49; 51; 52. 83, 62—67. 86, 164—170\*\*).  
 88, 57—60. 89, 115. 90, 201—206. 93, 102. 95, 92; 93. 96,  
 45—50. 98, 32. 99, 44—47. 100, 44—48. 101, 374; 375; 385.  
 103, 242 (241). 104, 218 (219). 107, 139. 110, 145 (146). 111,  
 104. 112, 214. 113, 98. 116, 95. 118, 193; 194. 119, 193; 204;  
 211; 214; 215; 218. 121, 277; 278. 122, 103; 104; 110; 111.  
 123, 339 (338). 124, 58. Amount: 177 stanzas.

\*) In D, with Br. the stanza is a gīti, but his reading is bad.

\*\*) Vs. 168 I follow Br., whose reading I prefer, in D that stanza is a gīti.

b.) *gīti:*

23, 89; 90. 24, 58; 231. 25, 297. 26, 146 (144); 147 (145);  
 271 (269); 272 (270); 284 (282). 34, 254; 263. 41, 61. 42,  
 223. 43, 242—244; 246—251; 253—255; 260; 261; 268—274\*).  
 44, 139. 382—412. 50, 203 (204); 204 (205); 211 (212). 51,  
 227. 52, 410. 56, 360 (361). 57, 175; 177. 59, 173; 179. 60,  
 254 (255). 66, 193. 67, 115. 69, 183. 78, 90—92<sup>2</sup>). 81, 114;  
 115. 82, 50. 85, 39. 87, 60. 92, 82; 83. 95, 94—96. 99, 39;  
 43; 57; 58. 100, 58. 101, 392. 103, 218 (217)—221 (220). 243  
 (242)—245 (244). 104, 219 (220). 105, 88; 89. 106, 186. 107,  
 135—138. 108, 207 (206). 109, 146—148. 110, 144 (145); 146  
 (147)—148 (149). 111, 106. 112, 208—211. 114, 141—144.  
 116, 94. 117, 65; 66; 175—181. 119, 191; 199—202; 219.  
 121, 279. 123, 344 (343); 345 (344). 124, 241 (242)—246 (247).  
 Amount: 162 stanzas.

\*) Vs. 274 is corrupt in D. Br.'s text has here the right reading.

<sup>1</sup>) The bracketed ciphers mark the numbers of the verses in Br.

<sup>2</sup>) These three gitis are also distinguished by their elegant inner rhyme.

## MATRĀCCHANDAS.

*Vaitāliya*: 43, 257. 56, 414; 415 (415; 416). 103, 215 (214).

Amount: 4 stanzas.

*Aupacchandasika*

Somadeva has these three types:

a.) each pāda begins by ˘˘—:

3, 79. 4, 137. 7, 112. 10, 216. 14, 90. 32, 194; 195 (195; 196). 38, 160. 45, 372. 56, 420 (421). 57, 174. 62, 236; 237. 64, 164. 72, 405. 92, 87. 101, 389; 390. 103, 201 (200)—209 (208). 211 \*). 106, 185. 112, 212. 116, 91; 92. 117, 171—174.

Amount: 36 stanzas.

\*) In Br., owing to a various reading, vs. 211 belongs to the type b.)

b.) each pāda begins by ˘˘˘—:

2, 82. 14, 89. 16, 123. 20, 227. 21, 145. 25, 298. 26, 270 (268). 34, 256. 36, 133. 59, 167. 73, 440. 102, 153. 103, 210 (209). 109, 149; 150. 116, 93. 123, 340 (339). Amount: 17 stanzas

c.) both types mixed.

34, 261; 262. 53, 197. 72, 406. 95, 97. 99, 42. 100, 59. 103, 215 (214). Amount: 8 stanzas. In all of them one pāda begins ˘˘˘—, the other three ˘ —.

## VRTTAM.

Trīṣṭubh I a.) *indravajrā*: 32, 192 (193). 45, 375—377; 379. 48, 123; 125; 126; 128; 136. 59, 168; 169; 174; 175. 72, 407. 76, 42. 88, 61. 92, 84; 86. 99, 48—50; 52; 53; 55. 103, 237 (236). 119, 198. Amount: 27 stanzas.

b.) *upendravajrā*: 34, 257. 101, 380. 103, 232 (231); 235 (234). Amount: 4 stanzas.

c.) *upajāti*: 4, 136. 12, 195. 25, 291. 29, 198; 199. 45, 369; 378; 380; 381. 48, 121; 122; 124; 127; 129—135. 49, 249 (251); 250 (252). 50, 208 (209); 209 (210). 58, 139. 59, 170. 90, 207. 92, 85. 96, 51. 99, 51; 54; 56. 101, 376—379; 386. 103, 198—200 (197—199); 213 (212); 231 (230); 233 (232); 234 (233); 236 (235). 118, 195. 119, 207; 209; 210. 123, 341 (340); 342 (341). Amount: 51 stanzas.

d.) *gālinī*: 18, 407. 25, 295. 36, 134. 37, 241. 53, 195. 84, 68. 99, 46 (cp. *supra*, p. 138). 101, 391. 110, 143 (144). Amount: 9 stanzas.

e.) *rathoddhatā*: 8, 38. 15, 148. 38, 159. 45, 365—

367. **46**, 249. **70**, 130. **119**, 194; 195. Amount: 10 stanzas.

f.) *svāgatā*: **40**, 116. Amount: 1 stanza.

Jagatī II a.) *vamçastha*: **12**, 194. **13**, 195. **32**, 193 (194). **34**, 249. **38**, 158. **50**, 206 (207). **53**, 196. **54**, 241. **58**, 140. **59**, 176—178. **101**, 382; 383. **103**, 197 (196). 212 (211). 222 (221) 223 (222); 225—230 (224—229). **106**, 183. **119**, 197. **122**, 112. Amount: 27 stanzas.

b.) *indravamçā*: **119**, 205; 206; 216. Amount: 3 stanzas.

c.) mixture of a.) and b.): **20**, 225. **101**, 381, Amount: 2 stanzas.

d.) *drutavilambita*: **119**, 208. Amount: 1 stanza.

Trişṭubh and jagatī mixed: One stanza 103, 230 (229).

Atijagatī III. *praharśinī*: **79**, 50. **86**, 171. Amount: 2 stanzas.

Çakvarī IV. *vasantilaka*: **1**, 66. **2**, 83. **5**, 141. **6**, 166. **7**, 111; 113. **13**, 194. **15**, 149. **16**, 121. **17**, 170. **18**, 405. **20**, 226; 228—230. **21**, 246. **23**, 87; 88; 92; 93. **24**, 229 (228). **25**, 296. **26**, 282 (280); 283 (281); 287 (285); 288 (286). **27**, 208—210. **28**, 193. **29**, 196; 197. **30**, 142; 143. **31**, 95; 96. **32**, 191 (192); 196 (197). **33**, 217. **34**, 248; 250; 253; 255; 259; 260; 264. **35**, 159—162. **37**, 242; 243. **38**, 161. **39**, 247. **41**, 60. **42**, 224. **43**, 275. **46**, 246; 247. **48**, 119; 120. **49**, 247 (249); 248 (250); 252 (254). **50**, 205 (206 \*); 212 (213). **52**, 409. **54**, 239. **55**, 238. **56**, 412 (413); 413 (414); 424 (425). **57**, 176. **59**, 172. **60**, 253 (254). **61**, 330. **66**, 188; 189. **67**, 113. **69**, 184; 185. **71**, 305. **73**, 441. **90**, 199. **99**, 40; 45. **101**, 384; 387; 388. **103**, 217 (216); 224 (223); 238—241 (237—240). **105**, 90; 91. **106**, 181; 182; 184. **108**, 209 (208). **109**, 151. **110**, 141 (142); 142 (143); 148 (149). **111**, 105. **112**, 213. **113**, 99. **114**, 140. **115**, 155; 156. **117**, 182. **118**, 197. **119**, 192; 203; 213. **120**, 133. **121**, 275; 276. **123**, 343 (342). **124**, 247 (248); 248 (249). Amount: 122 stanzas.

\*) defective in Br.

Atıçakvarī V. *mālinī*: **2**, 81. **5**, 140. **6**, 165. **22**, 259. **26**, 279—281 (277—279). **29**, 194; 195. **33**, 216. **34**, 247. **46**, 248. **47**, 121. **48**, 138. **49**, 251 (253). **67**, 112. **74**, 325. **98**, 75. **110**, 138 (139). Amount: 19 stanzas.

Atyaṣṭi VI. a.) *çikharinī*: **9**, 90. **10**, 217. **17**, 171. **22**, 254. **37**,

240. 40, 116. 44, 184 (185). 45, 368. 102, 152.

Amount: 9 stanzas.

b.) *prthvī*: 19, 118. 21, 148. 28, 189; 190. 30, 144. 34, 258. 44, 187 (188). 45, 364; 413. 47, 120. 52, 408. 54, 238. 55, 233; 234. 69, 182. 70, 132. 100, 57. 109, 152. 113, 100. 118, 196. Amount: 20 stanzas.

c.) *mandākrāntā*: 23, 94. 26, 285 (283). 42, 225. 64, 161. 66, 190. 110, 140 (141). Amount: 6 stanzas.

Atidhṛti VII. *çārdūlavikrīdita*: 6, 167. 13, 196. 24, 228 (227); 232 (231). 25, 290; 294. 26, 289 (287). 28, 191; 192. 43, 256. 44, 159; 160; 185 (186). 45, 373; 374. 48, 137. 52, 407. 56, 416 (417). 59, 31. 63, 195. 66, 191. 71, 303. 75, 196<sup>1)</sup>. 78, 132. 83, 39. 91, 61. 94, 137. 97, 48. 99, 41. 103, 214 (213). 104, 217 (218). 108, 208 (207). 110, 139 (140). 119, 196; 212; 217. 120, 132. 121, 280. 124, 249 (250); 250 (251).

Amount: 40 stanzas.

Prakṛti VIII. *sragdharā*: 24, 233 (232). One stanza.

Moreover there are two stanzas in Prākrit: 55, 125 and 126. They are composed in āryā metre. The second is a gīti; it is uncertain to what variety the first belongs, owing to the uncertainty of the text.

The total sum of these variously versified stanzas is 761. All other verses are anuṣṭubh çlokas. As the whole number of the verses of the Kathāsaritsāgara is 21388, it appears that about 3½ % of them are composed in other metres than the ordinary epic çloka. As a rule the artful versification displays itself at the end of the taraṅgas, but now and then such stanzas are met with amid the anuṣṭubhs, the course of which they underbreak; yet this is done sparingly and always for some good reason.

The list of the metres used shows also that the poet betrays his moderateness in this as he does in other respects. Though he was able to give samples of a greater metrical richness and variety, he limited himself to the most frequent types. He had apparently a predilection for the *gīti* form of the āryā and for the *vasan-tatilaka*, the latter of which he likes to employ for resuming the result of the events narrated or the *morale de la fable*; his use of *çārdūlavikrīdita* and *prthvī* is also relatively frequent. He must have avoided the *sragdharā*, employed but once, and the *hariṇī*, of which no instance at all is met with in his poem.

<sup>1)</sup> It is much for the credit of their author, that this stanza and the five next to it, each being the last of a taraṅga, are çārdūlavikrīditas of quite the same content, but of various expression, built as easily and fluently as ever.

## Index of notable Sanskrit words

As the words making up the list of p. 76—87 are put  
in alphabetical order, they are not included here.

	page		page
<i>anvaya</i> . . . . .	22. 23. 32	<i>nibhālayati</i> . . . . .	129
<i>apalapanā</i> . . . . .	53	<i>niyama</i> . . . . .	100
° <i>apasada</i> . . . . .	161	<i>nirlakṣmī</i> . . . . .	156. 157
<i>açakuna</i> . . . . .	73	<i>nispratibhāna</i> . . . . .	157
<i>āçraya</i> . . . . .	53	<i>pāthas</i> . . . . .	111
<i>utphalati</i> . . . . .	144	<i>pāravatakkho</i> (Paiçācī) . . . . .	30
<i>udghāta</i> . . . . .	131	<i>pārvāna</i> . . . . .	53
<i>upahartavya</i> etc., confoun- ded with <i>upahan</i> ° . . . . .	160	<i>bhāṣā</i> . . . . .	9
root <i>ubh</i> . . . . .	77	<i>marda</i> . . . . .	104
<i>aucitya</i> . . . . .	22. 23. 31	<i>Māra</i> . . . . .	147
<i>karṇiratha</i> . . . . .	137	<i>Mihilāropya</i> . . . . .	37
<i>kalatra</i> . . . . .	53 note	<i>mūrkha-kathās</i> . . . . .	17. 18
<i>kāvyaṁça</i> . . . . .	23	<i>mecaka</i> . . . . .	66
<i>kīlapāça</i> . . . . .	126	<i>yad astu</i>	
<i>gaganāñgana</i> . . . . .	115	<i>yad bhavatu</i>	66
<i>galādhvan</i> . . . . .	159	<i>yad bhavitā</i>	66
<i>galla</i> (= <i>ganda</i> ) . . . . .	128	<i>yad vidhattam</i>	
<i>ghūka</i> . . . . .	26	<i>ruddhaka</i> . . . . .	83
<i>ciranṭī</i> (= <i>cirayantī</i> ) . . . . .	80	<i>rūpaka</i> . . . . .	55
<i>chāyādvitiya</i> . . . . .	39	<i>lambaka</i>	11. 59
° <i>jāni</i> . . . . .	129	<i>lambhaka</i>	11. 59
<i>tāmbula</i> . . . . .	49	<i>varam</i> used as a particle. 161. 162	
<i>dīnāra</i> . . . . .	55	° <i>vega</i> . Names ending in — 108	
<i>dṛḍhayati</i> — <i>drad̄hayati</i> . . . . .	88	<i>çālābhāñjikā</i> . . . . .	10
° <i>dr̄çvan</i> . . . . .	69	<i>sabrahmacārin</i> . . . . .	72 note. 140
<i>na param</i> . . . . . <i>yāvat</i> . . . . .	73	<i>samaya</i> . . . . .	100
<i>na māti sma</i> . . . . .	66. 110	<i>sammoda</i> . . . . .	102
<i>nāngeśv avaratata</i> . . . . .	110	<i>Sukhāvatī</i> . . . . .	20
		<i>hevāki</i> . . . . .	66

Index of passages quoted from other Sanskrit texts than  
Kathāsaritsāgara and Br̥hatkathāmañjarī

	page
<b>Avadānaçataka</b>	157
I, 48 <sup>10</sup> .....	157
189 <sup>7</sup> .....	87
223 <sup>15</sup> .....	85
<b>Kṣemendra: Aucityavicāracarcā</b> čl. 7.....	23 note
<b>The (Pāli) Jātaka</b>	87
I, 266 <sup>14</sup> .....	87
<b>Jātakamālā</b>	159
VI, 27 .....	159
p. 221 <sup>15</sup> .....	132
<b>Tantrākhyāyika</b>	51
(ed. Hertel)	
<b>Daçakumāracarita</b>	161
Uttarakh., IV <sup>th</sup> Ucchv.....	161
<b>Divyāvadāna</b>	157
p. 633 <sup>25</sup> .....	157
<b>Pāṇini</b>	78
III, 2, 13 .....	78
<b>Prabodhacandrodaya</b>	88
V, st. 28.....	88
<b>Mudrārākṣasa</b>	54 n.
I, st. 15 *.....	54 n.
III, at the beginning.....	131
IV, p. 179 (ed. Trimbañ Telang).....	51
bharatavākyā.....	52. 53
<b>R̥gvedasamhitā</b>	77
I, 63, 4	
IV, 1, 15	77
IV, 19, 4	
<b>Varāhamihira: Yogayātrā</b> 7, 14 *.....	85
<b>Çlokasamgraha</b> of the Br̥hatkathā,	41—43
and judgment about it.	and 56—59

The asterisks point out places critically treated.









English - p. 178

Widener Library



3 2044 105 342 372